THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXXXIII, No. 5 NOVEMBER, 1955

CONTENTS

The Lady of the Canticle ..... *Francis X. Curley, S.J.* 289

Call for Vision and Daring ..... *John Patrick Reid, O.P.* 300

The Ecclesiastical Orders of Knighthood. Part II *James Van der Veldt, O.F.M.* 309

The Holy Father's Statement on Relations between the Church and the State ..... *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 323

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., and Walter J. Schmitz, S.S.

Attendance at CCD Classes 332

Distance to a Catholic School 332

Quantity of Oil to be Blessed on Holy Thursday 333

Drunkenness Induced for Experimental Purposes 334

Ringing of Bells 336

Tone of Voice to be Used at Mass 337

The Time for the Eulogy at a Funeral 337

Dimensions of Altar Linens 338

Wearing of the *Pallium* 338

When the Laity Should Stand, Sit, or Kneel at High Mass 338

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1955, by the Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

ANALECTA

The Holy Father's Address to the Tenth International Congress of Historical Sciences 340

A Pronouncement by the Holy Office on MRA 351

BOOK REVIEWS

The Catholic Approach to Protestantism. *By George H. Tavard, A.A.* 352

Jesus and His Times. *By Daniel-Rops. Translated by Ruby Millar* 353

How to Meditate. *By A. Desbuquoit. Translated and arranged by G. Protopapas, O.M.I.* 357

The Word: A Meditation on the Prologue to St. John's Gospel: *By Adrienne von Speyr. Translated by A. Dru* 359

Simulate **STAINED GLASS** WITH **LITHOPHANE**

SERIES OF 6 MEDALLIONS

Each 18" x 18"

Authentically hand detailed in full color stained glass effect.

Birth of the Virgin, Nativity, Ave Maria, Education, Flight to Egypt, & Coronation.

per copy $9.95
Entire set of 6 medallions only $54.

Now any smooth glass can be transformed into attractive church-like windows. Appropriate stock patterns that are easy, quick to do and inexpensive. Simply soak in water and smooth on glass. Can readily be washed and last for generations.

Geometric Multicolored basic Lithophane for filler and border, 37 sq. ft. 18½" x 25", $12.50.

Illustrated (hand detailed in full color) Adoring Angel No. 1250 at left; Adoring Angel No. 1260 at right; Our Lady No. 1280, center. 10½" x 42"—$15.00 ea. 17½" x 72"—$19.50 ea.

CONFESSIONAL Booth Drape
Heavy wine red VELOUR. Tailored with shirred or loop tops and chain weighted hems. Beautiful and durable.
Reg. $35.00 Special **$22.75**
(*Send sizes, we custom cut free*)
Embroid. Symbol—$5.00 extra

Easily adapted to larger or smaller windows. (Send window sizes for free layout catalog and samples.)

IVALCO

DEPT. A-11.
5206 TILDEN AVE.
BROOKLYN 3, N. Y.

THE LADY OF THE CANTICLE

"Thou art all fair, O my love, and there is no blemish in thee" (4:7)

When one runs across this text today, a verse that has been enshrined in the Mass of the Immaculate Conception and applied by countless preachers to Our Lady, one is apt to overlook the fact that for a thousand years it conveyed a very different meaning to the Christian soul. This is not to scant the Marian applications, indeed we shall see some exquisite ones; but it is to call to mind also the earlier allegorical and ascetical comments on this passage.

The Canticle as a whole poses a great problem for exegetes.[1] Historically there is a solid tradition among the Fathers which thoroughly ignores a merely historical interpretation in favor of a spiritual one.[2] They had an excellent argument in their favor; the marriage imagery was a favorite prophetic device from the time of Hosea to express parabolically the relation between Yahweh and Israel. A notable example of this is to be found in Isaiah:

"No more shall you be named 'Forsaken,'
nor your land be named 'Desolate';
But you shall be called 'My delight is in her,'
and your land 'Married';
For the Lord delights in you,
and your land shall be married.
As a young man marries a maiden,
so shall your Builder marry you;
And as a bridegroom rejoices over his bride,
so shall your God rejoice over you."
(62:4-5)

[1] A brief history of Canticle's historical trends will be found in A. Robert, *Le Cantique des Cantiques* (S. Bible series, Paris, 1951), pp. 8-9. The clearest and most adequate coverage of trends in interpretation is to be found in Roland Murphy's excellent summary, "Recent Literature on the Canticle of Canticles," *Cath. Bibl. Q.*, XVI (1954), 1-11. The same author deals lucidly with dramatic and interpretative content in "The Canticle of Canticles in the Confraternity Version," *AER*, CXXXIII, 2 (Aug. 1955), 87-98.

[2] II Council of Constantinople (553) condemned the view of Theodore of Mopsuestia, who taught that the Canticle was written to celebrate Solomon's marriage to the daughter of Pharaoh and should be understood in no other sense (cf. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conc. Coll.*, IX, 225-27).

The Fathers similarly read the Canticle in terms of such union, and extend it to illustrate the bond between Christ and his Church. This might be called a parabolic-allegorical exegesis. "In the plan of divine providence the election of Israel was a preparation for the establishment of the Church by Christ. . . . God's love for Israel foreshadowed Christ's love for his Church . . . the two senses—Judaic and Christian—are two complementary senses forming together one sense and one interpretation."[3]

From the sixteenth century up to our own day various rational scholars have refused to see any religious significance in the Canticle. They view it as "an amorous pastoral gone astray into the canon, as if a statue of Aphrodite had been clothed by pious people in the garb of a madonna."[4] How different is the foregoing from the development suggested by Pouget and Guitton:

> . . . We are inclined to believe that its interpretation passed through three stages, which were virtually present from the beginning as a germ planted by inspiration. In its first phase, it was a work of the imagination, an historical and lyrical drama, designed to give a lesson on conjugal fidelity. It soon became a parable whose chief aspect was to illustrate the love of Yahweh for His people. And finally it was an allegory, when the literal sense was forgotten, and a treatise on spiritual mysticism was drawn from the sacred verses.[5]

At an early date the school of Alexandria, under Origen's influence, broadened the limits of interpretation, adding ascetical implications. They did this by interpreting the Canticle on a personal basis, making it a mutual expression of love between Christ and the individual soul. Gradually through the centuries the applications became more mystical, and exegesis became more an exercise of pious ingenuity, culminating in the Victorine period.[6] It was

[3] P. Saydon, "The Canticle of Canticles," *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (London: Nelson, 1955), p. 383-j. Cf. also Pouget and Guitton (tr. Lilly), *The Canticle of Canticles* (New York: McMullen, 1948), p. 124. It is interesting to note that Alcuin, some 1,200 years ago, interprets the Canticle precisely as set down by Saydon, a Hebraic expression of longing for the Messiah which is fulfilled by Christ and his Church (*Compendium in Cant. Cant.*, cap. 4 [*MPL*, C, 652]).

[4] Pouget and Guitton, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 124.

[6] Hugh of St. Victor *et al.* were much maligned by the scholars of the "enlightenment" and by the nineteenth-century hypercritics. Scholarship to-

during this later development, roughly the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, that Mariological interpretation became popular and even dominant. Some verses of the Canticle, such as the *tota pulchra es,* today seem to be Mariological, to the exclusion of any other sense. Wherefore, a selective study of the interpretation of our text will not be without interest, tracing as it does the differing historical trends in exegesis for a thousand years.

CHRISTOLOGICAL READINGS

Theodoretus of Cyrus (†circa 457), in his commentary, ties our text in with Saint Paul's Epistles and explains it in terms of Christ's union with his Church and with each individual soul. The bishop exhorts us to compare the words "thou art all fair, O my love, and there is no blemish in thee" with those of Paul when speaking of Christ the Bridegroom "presenting to himself the Church in all her glory, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing . . . holy and without blemish" (*Eph.* 5:27). He tells us that the spouse, the Church, "comes forth immaculate and beautiful because the approach of the Beloved can be heard. The result is that his glory colors her and his radiance shines round her." Then, by a deft twist, Theodoretus uses his idea to inculcate an ascetical principle by extending the application to the individual listener or reader. "Would that we might also be given this gift so that 'reflecting as in a mirror the glory of the Lord we might be transformed into his very image from glory to glory'!" (*II Cor.* 3:18).[7] To anticipate for a moment the method of later centuries, re-read the brief quotations from Theodoretus describing the Church, and see how felicitously they describe Our Lady and her union with the Incarnate Word at the Annunciation. "His glory colors her and his radiance shines round her."

The Canticle proved a great attraction for Saint Gregory of Nyssa, who has left us fifteen lengthy homilies on it, and his application of 4:7 is unusual enough to rate a quick glance. He uses it to throw a barb at the oriental fatalists who surrounded

---

day is making redress. Cf. Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (New York: Philosoph. Library, 1952), pp. 83-106; P. Spicq, *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au moyen age* (Paris: Libr. Philosophique, 1944), *passim.*

[7] *In Cant. Cant.,* Lib. II (*MPG,* LXXXI, 134-35). The writer offers his own translations throughout.

him. In so doing, though, he is careful not to place all stress on the individual will, thus avoiding the pit of Pelagianism which will soon yawn in the Church. "I will go up to the mountain of myrrh and to the hill of frankincense, Thou art all fair, O my love, and there is no blemish in thee" (4:6-7). Gregory asserts that the mountain of myrrh and the hill of frankincense represent the beatific vision which is our destiny, and verse seven refers to Christ from whom all grace comes to the Church, His Mystical Body. "No individual bears all alone the burden of his soul. While it is true that he can carry his burden higher, or set it aside on the slopes of the mountain . . . this power does not come from his own efforts (lest pride overwhelm him), but from the grace of Him who endured death for sinners."[8]

An even more detailed application to the individual soul is contained in the pseudo-Gregorian writings. The difficulty is proposed by the commentator that this verse cannot refer to sinners and their relationship to Christ because of the very spotlessness it extolls. He then answers his problem, at least to his own satisfaction. There is a great marshalling of texts to support the allegation that the spouse cannot be termed beautiful or spotless. Did not Job, he insists, clearly declare this when he asked "can man be justified compared with God; or he that is born of woman appear clean? Behold, even the moon doth not shine, and the stars are not pure in his sight" (25:4-5). Saint James too tells us the same thing, declaring that "in many things we all offend" (3:2); and John: "if we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us" (*I John* 1:8). Considering that the opposition has been sufficiently built up, he now proceeds to destroy it by carefully explaining how this verse, in the new dispensation, refers to individual Christians. "Provided that a holy soul cleanses away its daily accretion of venial sins through sorrow, and rinses out slighter stains with tears, always guarding the gates against the incursion of mortal sin, then (even though sins be committed) the soul is beautiful to behold because of its penitence."[9]

[8] *In Cant. Cant.*. Hom. VII (*MPG*, XLIV, 906).

[9] S. Greg. Mag., *Super Cant. Cant. Expositio*, cap. 4 (*MPL*, LXXIX, 510). Actually written ca. 1000 by Robert de Tombelaine. (Cf. Capelle, *Rev. Bened.* [1929], 204-17).

Similar to this, but much more expressive, is the notation of Gilbert Foliot, twelfth century Bishop of London. He too sees these words as addressed by the Saviour to an individual soul, and he uses the occasion to write a brief lesson on the sacraments and the practice of virtue. It is a happy example of progressing from the ascetico-mystical content of the verse to a wider application of the exegesis without at the same time futilely claiming that all the catechetics is actually in the citation itself. Christ speaks to the soul:

> And do you know why I will come to you? It is because "thou art all fair, O my love, and there is no blemish in thee." The external features of your beauty have already been catalogued, and what is foremost is finally set down at the end—the totality of beauty which resides in your interior loveliness. For by the flow of baptismal water or by the gushing forth of a martyr's blood the stain of mankind is washed away. Then it is that the interior graces which it pleases the Father to bestow begin to adorn the soul. The result is that a pleased Bridegroom comes smilingly to dwell with so fair a soul.[10]

The selections quoted, a representative cross-section of the ideas of both the Greeks and the Latins, show a unanimity of interpretation. The mystic bond between Christ and his bride—be it the Church or an individual—is the lesson drawn from the Canticle. But where is Mary in all this? Surely she is the fair spouse who is without blemish; for in addition to the presence of our text in the Mass of the Immaculate Conception, the Marian Year prayer composed by Pius XII closes with it. Let us now observe the gradual identification of these words with Our Lady.

MARIOLOGICAL READINGS

One of the earliest and loveliest of the Marian applications is found in the eighth century writings of Saint John Damascene, last of the Greek Fathers. The poignant moment for which he employs it is the closing seconds of Mary's exile here on earth before she goes to join her Son in glory. She is waiting patiently, as always, for God to manifest his will to her, the *fiat* ready to spring to her lips. Suddenly she hears a voice saying to her out of the heavens "thou art all fair, O my love, and there is no blemish in thee." Saint John concludes simply, "That most holy

[10] *Expositio in Cant. Cant.*, cap 4 (*MPL*, CCII, 1259). It is ironical to note the bishop's reference to martyrdom here; he sided with Henry II against St. Thomas Becket.

Virgin, upon hearing these words, places her soul in the hands of her Son."[11]

Just as the previous writer envisioned Christ as almost compelled to his exclamation when beholding Mary, so a later Greek author, the Emperor Matthew Cantacuzenus, places such a compulsion on any human being who considers the prerogatives of God's Mother.

> Consider for a moment the fusing of divinity and humanity when the Word of God takes on Himself flesh. Ponder on the Mother of God, totally preserved from any taint of sin, and the cause of the Salvation of the entire world. Filled with the enlightening spirit of the Spirit, can you desist from crying out to Mary: "thou art all fair, O my love, and there is no blemish in thee?[12]

Writing at the dawn of the scholastic triumph, Philip of Harvengt (†1183), who had a wide knowledge of the Fathers and a keen theological mind, adapts this verse as a scriptural indication of the Immaculate Conception. He arbitrarily places our text in the mouth of Gabriel at the time of the Annunciation, and then shows how appropriate it is to that salvific instant.

> For the Holy Spirit overshadows her, conferring the plenitude of grace. In her the law of our iniquity is not operative. Neither recent sin nor the ancient transgression of man is within her. Just as the historic blemish is a thorough disfigurement, so is her spotlessness all beautiful.

He goes on to describe how her freedom from original sin lends lustre and strength to her faculties, making her a valiant as well as a beautiful woman.

> There is beauty in the poised keenness of her intellect and will. Hers is not a soul to faint along the way. Nor does her flesh make a mockery of the spirit. That blessed spirit, exercising absolute command over its lower nature, bends to no bidding but God's. With firm foot she treads his paths.[13]

---

[11] *Homilia II in Dormit. B.V.M.*, no. 10 (*MPG*, XCVI, 735).

[12] *Comment. in Cant. Cant.* (*MPG*, CLII, 997-h).

[13] *Comment. in Cant. Cant.*, Lib. IV, cap. 17 (*MPL*, CCIII, 379-80). Blessed Amadeus of Lausanne in a similar passage (*Homiliae*, Hom. II [*MPL*, CLXXXVIII, 1309]) puts the introit of the Imm. Conc. Mass (*Gaudens gaudebo . . .* [*Isaias* 61:10]) on the lips of an angelic chorus at

A contemporary of Philip's, Alan of Lille (in his *Compendious Elucidation of the Canticle of Canticles,* no less), has much the same exegesis. Mention is made of him here as a thin excuse for bringing to light his delightful preface to the book. Reading it, one thinks of Polonius' artful disclaimers of art; yet one feels too that this "Universal Doctor," as his contemporaries called him, is sincere in acknowledging his inability to do justice to Mary. Through the rhetoric shines an appealing personality.

> Whereas for the adornment of the tabernacle of God many men offer gold, silver, precious gems, fine linens, scarlet twice dyed, and purple cloth, I follow the custom of other men and make an offering of goat's hair (*Exod.* 30). And though the wealthy bestow moneys from their abundance upon the treasury of the Lord, I contribute my two mites, like the poor old lady in the Gospel (*Mark* 12). And while many who are rich in virtue, pure of soul, and afire with love, exert Solomon's wisdom and Cicero's eloquence in praising the Virgin Mother (who is the tabernacle of God, the palace of heaven's King, the storehouse of all holiness), I must hesitatingly set forth this poor work in her praise, since I am but a beggar in knowledge, a nobody in grace, battered about by life's trials, and covered with the bruises and scars of sin. Yet, because even a crude lump of mineral can be fashioned into a precious ornament, some sweetness may yet flow from my pen.[14]

And flow it does. Like so many other writers in praise of Mary (in Migne alone there are one hundred and thirty-two *prominent* ones ranging from Tertullian in the third century to Innocent III in the thirteenth), Alan seems especially inspired by his gracious subject. His work is recommended to those interested in Mariology, since by intent and with not a little ingenuity he turns each verse of the Canticle to her honor. It is excessive, to be sure, but a most interesting example of a devotional *tour de force.*

THE VICTORINES

Due to recent and current research into the manuscript wealth of the School of Saint Victor, already alluded to, this group of writers is once again enjoying a vogue as well as a favorable reestimation. No longer, happily, is it stylish (or even intelligent)

---

the Annunciation. As they salute her, they are "lost in wonder at the chaste young girl who is now God's mother and will soon reign as their queen."

[14] *Elucidatio in Cant. Cant.,* praefatio (*MPL,* CCX, 51-53).

to direct a sneer at their contributions to biblical scholarship. It is becoming increasingly apparent that we owe them a deep debt. They stemmed the tide of mystical excogitation *about* Holy Writ and set out to see what Scripture had to say for itself. Hugh of Saint Victor and his fellows, notably Richard and Andrew, sought through a study of Hebrew idiom and rabbinic literature to restore the literal sense to exegesis. That they erred in the other direction is little discredit to them, nor would we think it such if we could grasp the magnitude of their goal. It was, in short, a complete reversal of contemporary exegesis, a re-emphasis on history and critical scholarship, a seeking out of God's word rather than some commentator's. As will be seen from the selections on Mary, these men were not strangers to devotion or even mysticism. But they strove first to learn the literal sense. All this is perhaps a digression, though it does put the Victorines in their historical context and indicates why their reputation is fast being restored.

In a sermon long attributed to Hugh, Richard of Saint Victor takes us briefly through the literal and mystical meanings of our text; but his purpose is not precisely or solely exegetical. It is a feast day of the Blessed Mother, and his lyric love sings on, even in translation.

> Who is it, my brothers, whose voice we hear in this verse? To whom is it spoken? A friend calls to a friend, a bridegroom to a spouse, a chaste one to an immaculate one, an incorrupt man to an integral woman. God speaks to a soul—a soul such as was hers whose festival we celebrate today.
>
> "Thou art all beautiful." Thou art beautiful within and without, in heart and in body. There is fire's flame within and snow's whiteness without, the whole in harmony. The flame is charity, the whiteness chastity, the harmony humility. "Thou art all beautiful, and there is no blemish in thee." All beauty is in you, nor is there present the slightest taint . . . beautiful by nature, more lovely by grace, most splendid in the glory of your soul.[15]

Then, with a facility in apposite Old Testament illustration that should be the model and envy of a preacher today, he finds a parallel to enrich his theme. The congregation is presented with the

[15] *Sermones Centum,* Serm. IX (*MPL,* CLXXVII, 918). Listed in Migne among Hugh's writings, these sermons were more likely done by Richard. (Cf. Chatillon, *Rev. du Moyen Age Latin* [1948], 23-52).

dramatic scene in the second chapter of Esther, wherein the young maiden is adorned with perfumes and spices, and clad in gorgeous damask. After this, superbly fair, with beauty past all belief, she wins the heart of the great Xerxes and is crowned queen "of one hundred and twenty-seven provinces, from India on this side to Ethiopia on that" (*Esth.* 1:1). Richard makes the obvious but nonetheless telling application to Mary.

> And so did God act too. But vastly more so. He prepared his spouse by enriching and adorning her soul, from the treasure-room of his graces, with the vesture of all virtues . . . "all glorious is the king's daughter as she enters; her raiment is threaded with spun gold. In embroidered apparel she is borne in to the king; behind her the virgins of her train . . . borne in with gladness and joy, enter the palace of the king" (*Psalm* 44:14-16).[16]

Such a poetic flight on the wings of one small verse of the Canticle may be all very well in a sermon, but what about straight exegesis? When he comes to that, Richard offers us a simple but most striking thought. It is the notion of *totality* in the text. He sees its mysterious application to Mary as completely dependent on that idea, that word. God, when he created all things, saw that all things were good; every creature of God participates to some extent in the goodness of God. All souls in grace are pleasing to the Bridegroom, and the Church too is pleasing in every single age. But it is uniquely Mary's to be *totally* good, *totally* pleasing, *totally* beautiful. That, basically, is Richard's teaching; he supports it by showing clearly and sweetly just how this totality is perfectly fulfilled in her, making her perfectly fulfill the text.

> The Blessed Virgin was all beautiful . . . she never committed any sin either great or small; nor was such a thing thinkable, overshadowed as she was by the Most High. She was the temple from whose very fabric God was fashioned. Could a temple so dedicated ever in any way be defiled? Not only did she have grace, then, but she had the fullness of grace; she possessed every single virtue without its opposing passion. What is more, she joyously possessed them and constantly exercised them, having not the taste nor the least thought nor the will for anything evil.[17]

---

[16] *Ibid.*

[17] *Explicat. in Cant. Cant.*, cap. 26 (*MPL*, CXCVI, 482-84).

Richard continues to emphasize her total absorption in goodness by selecting some of the specific virtues that ornamented her soul, demonstrating the special way that they were operative in Mary's life. The currently stressed notions of Mary as mediatrix of all grace through her Son, as co-redemptrix of the world with her Son, have seldom been as well expressed. Note again the totality refrain.

So dilated with love for mankind was Mary's heart that her charity extended itself not merely to her own race but to all men, the famous and the unknown. She declared that salvation should come to each and every man. She begged for this. And she obtained it. Since the Saviour of all men came to us through her agency, can she not in truth be hailed as the salvation of the world?[18]

Brief but eloquent mention is made of Mary's external appearance, and then there is an unexpected reference to external events in her life. Even these, the writer insists, only serve to reinforce the totality of her beauty. His direct reference is to her "martyrdom" which adds the final glory. His notion that Mary's love for Christ *is* her martyrdom, while for others that same love sweetens their sufferings, is a theme that could well be developed during the Three Hours devotion.

Though she brought to earth the purity of angels, Mary possessed withal total humility. And this internal loveliness was reflected in her appearance . . . angelic purity shone forth from an angelic face, a face and form to match her mind and heart. The sun which glorifies the day, and the great star hung on the evening sky, are but dusty reflections of Mary's splendor. And the saints of the Church, standing out like sun and stars, are cast into shadow by her brilliance.

Beyond all the foregoing, she wore the glory of martyrdom. A sword was plunged through her heart, a sword whose blade was not wrung from steel but from sorrow—a far fiercer martyrdom. So immeasurable was her love that her grief too was beyond reckoning. In the case of all other martyrs their great love palliated their agony. It intensified hers. She suffered in the mind, and totally, more than has any martyr ever suffered in the flesh.[19]

With Richard of Saint Victor's ardent exposition of totality we come to the close of this survey. Since his day the *tota pulchra es* has been a Marian verse, and such it will continue to be until the

[18] *Ibid.*

[19] *Ibid.*

end of the world. But this paper may serve to recall what a wealth of ascetico-mystical implications the varying trends of exegesis have discovered in any given verse (especially if it be from the Canticle). Yahweh speaks to Israel, Christ hails his Church, the Saviour calls to a soul, the Church extols Mary. And Mary, in turn, will lovingly speak these words to any soul that comes trustingly to her, "Thou art all fair, O my love, and there is no blemish in thee."

FRANCIS X. CURLEY, S.J.

Weston College
Weston, Mass.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for November, 1905, contributed by Fr. John Fryar, of England, is entitled "Old English Burial Customs," and contains some very interesting information. Thus, the writer narrates the development of the word "hearse" to its present meaning. Originally it signified the frame for holding candles used for the Tenebrae. Later this frame was placed near the corpse at the funeral rites, and finally the conveyance for the body was called the hearse. Father Fryar also informs us that an act was passed in the reign of Charles II forbidding the wrapping of corpses in linen, to prevent money from going out of the kingdom by the buying and importation of linen from other countries. He notes also the custom of burying an hour-glass in the coffin as a symbol that the sands of time had run out. . . . Several writers object to the views of Bishop Bellord on sacrifice and the Mass. . . . The anonymous S.L.T. describes the liturgical ceremonies for the corner-stone laying and the blessing of a school. . . . Bishop Jules Chatron, continuing his series of articles on "Experiences of a Missionary Bishop in Japan," describes some of the difficulties of missionaries in that land and also the consolation afforded by the devotion of the Japanese Catholics. . . . Fr. J. Ferreres, S.J., discussing the administration of the sacraments to those who are apparently dead, asserts that besides putrefaction, and perhaps cadaveric rigidity, there is no symptom that is a positive indication of death. He believes that those who have been seized by sudden death may be absolved conditionally even twelve hours subsequently. . . . Fr. E. Devine, S.J., continues his novel "The Training of Silas." . . . In the Studies and Conferences section the moral problem involved in the case of Catholics who sing at Protestant church services is discussed, and it is correctly pointed out that this is contrary to the law of God.

F. J. C.

CALL FOR VISION AND DARING

The present Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, is a shining example to tell all of us of priestly zeal for souls. In spite of his severe illness in the early months of 1955, which left him almost too weak to address in person the parish priests and Lenten preachers of Rome, he wrote out every paragraph of his message with his own hand. The Pope's exhortation for this year lays down six forthright and challenging principles for the guidance of those who have the care of souls. Reading through the message one can hardly help being struck by the thought: what a sublime summons to heroism, a clarion call from the Supreme Pastor to his priestly helpers for the vision and daring which the apostolate needs today perhaps as never before.

His Holiness was speaking to about seven hundred of his clergy, at the first general audience he granted after his long siege of illness. The Pontiff warned them first that they must forego haste with the erring soul and "await the opportune moment." There was no encouragement in his words for those whose imprudence and precipitate concern for quick results urge them to settle for a conversion which is really no more than a compromise. Priests were urged by the Pope, in effect, to raise their sights to the highest degree of sanctity for those under their care. The major portion of his magnificent discourse set forth and developed the six guiding principles which every shepherd of souls should keep ever in mind in his daily round of labors.

I. PRUDENCE AND DISCRETION

The priest apostle must approach the erring soul with prudence and discretion, not with arguments it does not understand, nor asking of it at once what it is not yet prepared to give. Himself an apostolic soul of consummate tact and discretion, it is not surprising to hear the Holy Father recommend this wise moderation to his priests. Without a prudent, careful approach, apostolic endeavor has little chance of success; and this is particularly true in an environment which is in so many ways hostile or indifferent to the works of religion. The rule certainly applies in our own country with special force: how many souls have been sadly lost or alienated from the faith as a result of the intolerance and overbearing attitude of priests? Clerical courtesy may sound like a

weak and watered-down phrase to describe the ideal represented by the Pontiff's words: maybe so, but it is itself a noble and necessary ideal, and without it the spirit of moderation will have no effective expression in the priest's contact with souls.

The Pope issues a timely warning against a vain and impractical apologetics. For many (some would say most) men today, the polemic approach is positively repulsive: when their happiness is at stake, as it certainly is, if they have abandoned or neglected their religious duties, arguments and subtleties on a purely speculative plane make very little impression. Something other than logic and reasoning is required if the priestly apostle is to penetrate beneath the hard crust of indifference and attachment to sin and reach the wayward soul at a depth where vital contact can be made. Obviously the Pope's admonition in this connection does not in the least imply a repudiation of the intellectual approach or a dissatisfaction with traditional apologetics. It betokens rather a hard, realistic appraisal of the spiritual and mental condition in which most men and women of our age find themselves. And it calls for a thorough, accurate analysis on the part of priests of the ways in which this condition persists among the souls to whom they must address their apostolic efforts. Know your people, is what the Holy Father is, in effect, advising us: know what they can take and how much they can take. And, if need be, change your tactics to suit the peculiar needs which prevail among those who are in your pastoral charge.

It happens all too frequently that the over-zealous priest makes demands on people which exceed their present spiritual capacities. It is never a question of making saints overnight: Our Blessed Lord took three years with His Apostles, and even at the end of that period they were still astoundingly dull and slow in responding to the promptings of divine grace. There has been much concern quite recently about the problem of spiritual maturity in laymen. The concern is readily understandable and the suggestions offered to solve the problem are both sound and solidly practical. The vision here, however, must definitely be one of long range; a vision which never loses sight of the eminent goal on the horizon, but never forgets, either, that the goal is to be achieved in a gradual and ordered fashion. The steps taken may seem small and even halting, but they will be steady and sure and in the end progress will be made more securely and more economically.

II. COURAGE IN ADVERSITY

The priest must be constant and persistent in the face of hostility, coldness, and indifference, remaining firm "even when one falls victim of an anxiety that transforms into silent agonies certain nights that seem eternal." The Holy Father's lively awareness of the trials and tribulations which beset the priestly apostle in the exercise of his ministry is certainly reassuring, and his compassion for the priest who must face severe setbacks is greatly consoling. The watchword is: courage, a brave endurance of every sort of sorrow and disappointment, and hope, an unswerving confidence in the strength and support which Christ will not fail to supply. The strain may be almost unbearable at times, but the true apostle will not falter or despair: enlightened by a burning faith, his hope and courage will carry him through the blackest night from which, in the end, he cannot but emerge victorious.

There is so much wisdom and insight in this part of the Pope's message, so much the priest has to meditate on, come to appreciate and accept, and pray about—pray, above all. The resistance of sinful human nature to the workings of grace is beyond measuring: unless the priest is really convinced of this awful truth and prepared to accept it for what it really is, he may be bowled over when he encounters it in an unusually potent form. And to come to any meaningful understanding of this mystery—for it is a mystery, the mystery of iniquity which so fascinated the Apostle himself—one must dig down and study hard what the great masters in theology and the spiritual life have had to say about it. The priest whose grasp of this fundamental truth has never been more than fleeting and superficial will not survive the shock of meeting it alive, in the flesh, so to speak.

It would be futile to minimize or dismiss with pious platitudes the very real frustrations and contradictions which plague the efforts of even the most farsighted and dedicated of shepherds. Besides the coldness and indifference on the part of others, the priest has to contend with his own shortcomings—and it is this unrelenting struggle which seems the more wearying and at times even depressing. The priest who is honest with himself will find room for improvement in any number of areas of his personal life and his ministry to souls. Faced with a task that is literally superhuman, he will convince himself once and for all that he is absolutely helpless without the help of divine grace. Having reached

this conviction, and made it a solid, significant thing influencing all his priestly work, he will not be appalled at the realization of his own faults and limitations, but rather humbly grateful that the Lord should have chosen an instrument so weak and imperfect for the glorious mission of mediating to men the fruits of the Redemption.

A word might be said here about the worries of a priest, in particular of a parish priest. The Holy Father is filled with understanding and sympathy at the anxiety which haunts every priestly apostle overwhelmed with the many cares and concerns of the modern apostolate. Of course the priest will worry, that is, he will be deeply concerned at the problems which must be overcome in the accomplishment of his apostolic duties, and he will at times agonize over the loss of souls which he seems powerless to prevent. Worry in this sense will undoubtedly be one of the occupational hazards of the priestly vocation as long as men are men, as yet incompletely possessed by the healing grace of Christ; perhaps the one bit of advice in order here is: be sure you worry about the right matters, and be sure that your worry is not unrelieved by a vibrant Christian hope and loving confidence in the power and goodness of God.

III. SAINTLY DARING

The priest must be capable of what the Sovereign Pontiff calls "saintly daring" and not fear to propose the highest degrees of sanctity. Here is the heart of the message delivered on that occasion and it is characteristic of the sublime heroism of the present Holy Father and of his predecessor, of happy memory, who excoriated mediocrity and the spirit of compromise in devastating terms. The priest today must set his sights high: he must be a man of far vision and boundless enthusiasm for the life of union with God. To an awareness and appreciation of this life, which is nothing short of perfection, he must conduct those confided to his care. If he would settle for anything less, if he would be content with what he considers a harmless lukewarmness, he betrays his high trust; he is, quite simply, a failure.

In his extraordinary book, *Revolution In a City Parish,* the Abbé Michonneau poses the question: "Do you know what the most common reproach levelled against clergymen is?" And the answer is even more provocative than the question, hence we would like to quote in full:

It is what some like to call "prudence," even though they actually mean a sweet sort of decorum and aloofness. That mixture of unction, reserve and self-satisfaction has come to characterize—or caricature—the so-called "ecclesiastical" art and mannerisms and life. That this should be so is a real tragedy, because it is this very attitude of ours which makes us so repellent to souls longing for frankness, for truth. They reject our polite circumlocutions; they want the doctrine of Christ or they want nothing. In any case they do not want our delicateness. We are wrong to give the name of prudence to such a state of mind, for prudence is a strong weapon, whereas we are indecisive and timid. The people and the times demand stouthearted leaders to point out and lead the way to Christ; and to do it in such a way that our contemporaries will find a fullness for the vacuum they now experience. If we do not do this for them, no one else will or can.[1]

The Abbé's indictment is one which, sad to say, rings true: too many of us must plead guilty to the charge. Why is it, why are we hesitant to strike out into the deep and act boldly, proposing as the only ideal total surrender to God, an unflinching striving for Christian perfection? There are, very probably, a number of reasons: spiritual shortsightedness, laziness and blissful unconcern, a disconcerting awkwardness when faced with a challenge of uncommon proportions. All of these, to be sure, but one other, perhaps, above all, which the same author signalizes in these terms:

The truth of the matter is that most of us retreat to this misnamed prudence simply because we fear rebuffs, simply because we do not want to have our tranquil lives disturbed. A truer spirituality would realize that these rebuffs and this disturbance are an incalculable source of profit to us and to the souls we are supposed to be directing. What is needed is not haste, not foolhardiness, not brute force, but a profound sense of courage, based on the love of God and man. There is so much to be done.[2]

In our own as in every age the priests and prelates whom we admire most are precisely those who are not afraid to ask of men that they should follow Christ to the very end, even to the heights of sanctity. It is not given to anyone of us today, said Pius XI, to be mediocre: there is no place in the Church today for the half-baker or the parboiled. The world stands desperately in need of nothing less than a Christian revolution: and the greatest revo-

[1] (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1952), p. 164.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 165.

lutionaries have always been the saints. The priest simply cannot allow himself to set before his people any ideal short of sanctity, which means a total involvement in the Christ-life, a complete surrender to grace. Yes, he may have to wade through Garrigou-Lagrange's *Three Ages* for his sermons: it sounds fantastic, but the fact that it does sound so odd is itself an omen, a sign that something is radically wrong. The layman has to grow up, spiritually, or else he will be stunted, a dwarf in the spiritual order; and the priest must be his tutor in Christ.

IV. FACE THE FACTS

The priest must face the facts—avoiding superficiality by counting not only those who come to Mass and their Easter duties, but also those who do not. The Pope's words here may discomfort those pastors who like to beam with pride at the sight of packed Masses Sunday after Sunday, and to boast heartily of the parish organizations and activities which occupy himself and his assistants six nights out of seven. Numbers can be deceptive in more ways than one and the priest who is a slave to statistics, especially when they have the appearance of being impressive, is in for a rude awakening when and if the true state of affairs is brought home to him.

Perhaps the parish school is filled to overflowing and the pastor's major concern is where to find the funds to expand. Before he takes any great complacence in this situation, the parish priest might do well to recall that not half of our children are in parochial schools: what about the other fifty per cent? Don't they count in the pastor's concern with providing a Catholic education for the children of his parishioners? How many children in the parish ought to come to catechism classes but do not? At a far deeper level, how many of the parish faithful live in the state of grace? That is, of course, a question which no man can answer: but it is one which ought to occur once in a while, at least, to the man who is, by his vocation, the living instrument by which God distributes His richest and choicest graces. An accurate accounting, said His Holiness, holds unpleasant surprises for a priest who is concerned with souls.

V. WELCOME ALL HELP

The priest must welcome whoever offers to help him, not neglecting, ignoring or opposing any forces, whatever their banners or

badges, so long as they are blessed by the Church. The priest will accomplish very little that is lasting if he does not help lay people find their place in the Church. The salvation of the human race does not rest with the priest or the laity alone, but with the Church which includes both. The late Cardinal Suhard states it thus: "The complete instrument of evangelization is neither the one who has been simply baptized nor the priest alone, but the Christian community." The priest whose excessive self-esteem or unreasonable dislike for this or that apostolic group leads him to reject or ignore the help the lay group offers and is capable of providing, stands condemned by the present Holy Father's own words.

We have lay movements, plenty of them, thank God, and excellent ones, too. Let lay people take charge of them, let them realize that this is *their* movement, and that they do not have to be constantly worrying about what the parish priest will think. They are adult Christians, brought to spiritual maturity by the grace of Confirmation and prompted by the graces to which that sacrament gives them a title before God. The priest's task in their behalf is to help them form Christ in their souls—a work which has been honestly described as less glamorous, more trying and exacting, and demanding greater skills than preaching, teaching, or personally witnessing Christ in the social arena. St. Gregory the Great called it "the art of arts." It is a necessary art for the priestly apostle: he must cultivate it or risk throwing away an indispensable source of help in the task of carrying Christ into the world of men. Lay movements formed for apostolic works are a boon from heaven: cherish them, urges the Holy Father, and utilize their skill and their zeal to the fullest. The Church's task is greater, more complex than ever before; willing hearts and strong hands are needed in every area of modern life, and the priest must welcome them wherever he finds them. "God's field is vast and the needs of cultivation numerous," the Pope concludes, and the priest cannot bring in the harvest all by himself.

VI. AVOID INDIVIDUALISM AND SUPERFICIALITY

The priest must avoid individualism, whereby fervent undertakings fail to achieve what one would expect of them because they "struggle too much on their own, and are too disjointed and disunited." The apostolic labors and spiritual reforms called for by the present-day religious crisis are certainly beyond the strength

of any one priest, but not of a well-organized and smoothly functioning parish team. The Pontiff calls for teamwork, for a combining and exchange of efforts and talents, so that what could not be accomplished by a lone individual may be successfully achieved by priests and people working together.

The priest may be disturbed at his own lack of familiarity with the actual condition of his people, culturally and spiritually. He can be helped to overcome this handicap by a conscientious and well-informed layman. "The apostle," said the Holy Father, "cannot refrain from considering the moral weakness of others, their intellectual lack of preparation, the persons and things among which they live, and the shore, so to speak, from which the erring soul must come to him. . . ." Ignorance in these matters would be disastrous for the priest, he must seek and make use of the judgment of others. "It may be a question of re-establishing contacts that have been broken, and hence it is necessary to approach carefully the erring soul, reviving in it interest that has been lost, and seeking to restore a language that perhaps has been forgotten completely." Again, the priest must see to it that his own defects and possible idiosyncrasies do not prove fatal in his approach to convert others.

Superficiality is a grave danger in any important undertaking where patience and wisdom are wanting. "It sometimes happens that one does not obtain what one desires and it is rare that it can be obtained immediately . . . one must be able to remain standing even when everything urges hesitation. Superficiality generates what could be called the criterion of approximation, the disastrous effects of which are encountered in all spheres not excluding that of the apostolate. To prevent such consequences statistics are needed, compiled seriously and with realism and calm impartiality. . . . Once the figures have been established, their meaning must be studied in order to learn the cause why some remain aloof and why some return. The ascertainment of the illness is not the diagnosis, and without this there can be no talk of prognosis and much less of adequate treatment." The priest must be a wise and patient physician, diagnosing with care the ills which afflict his flock and applying with skill the supernatural remedies which alone can restore health and a vigorous spiritual life.

"Open your arms to all," said the Holy Father, "blessing whatever the Church approves. Whoever is animated by good will finds

a place in the vineyard of the Lord, who accepts every service just as He seeks laborers at all hours." The Pontiff offers much encouragement to all his priests who are striving courageously to walk worthy of the vocation where unto they are called. Speaking with specific reference to the Eternal City he said that in the whole of Rome today there is a fervor of new life. There are more churches. Priests are making frequent Mass attendance easier and more fruitful. The Holy Father praised the adult religious instruction courses and the diligent attention given to youth, especially in the schools.

* * * * *

The call has gone forth: sanctify your ministry, bring your people to a vivid realization of the sublime dignity which is theirs as children of God, redeemed by the Son of God and called to be saints. The priest is to associate layfolk with himself most intimately in the work of restoring all things to Christ. The Pontiff's exhortation is clear and unequivocal: "Above all, take care of their spiritual formation. Have them put on Jesus Christ; nourish them with Him; make of His Divine Heart a model from which they may draw inspiration in their thoughts, their affections, their desires, their words and actions. Have them surrender their heart in Jesus and in the arms of His heavenly Mother . . . the apostolate must be exercised in factories, in schools, in large apartment houses, not only by one's presence, but also by one's actions; there must be someone to initiate and bring into action, under your guidance and with your blessings a band of 'lay missionaries.' Be exacting in pointing out their goals to them and be constant in encouraging them toward their realization."

The ideal set for his priests by their Supreme Pontiff is not a new one: it has about it the authentic ring of heroism which is the hallmark of Christlike priestly endeavor in every age. It requires of priests today, as it always has and always will, vision and daring—without these the heights will not even be glimpsed and certainly they will never be scaled.

JOHN PATRICK REID, O.P.

Providence College
Providence, Rhode Island

THE ECCLESIASTICAL ORDERS OF KNIGHTHOOD

PART II

THE SOVEREIGN MILITARY ORDER OF ST. JOHN OF JERUSALEM

This order, also called the Order of Rhodes and more widely known as the Order of Malta, from the locations of its headquarters after it was forced to leave the Holy Land, is the oldest order of knighthood in existence, antedating even that of the Order of the Garter by more than two hundred years. It is also the most illustrious and meritorious of the religious military orders. Its origin goes back to the hospital for Christian pilgrims in Jerusalem, established in the first half of the 11th century by a group of merchantmen from Amalfi, Italy. When the crusaders captured Jerusalem in 1099 the hospital was headed by a layman named Gerard whose birthplace is variously given as Martiques in Provence, Amalfi in southern Italy and Tonco in Piedmont, all in line with the respective nationality of the historians who wrote his life.[1] This saintly man organized the hospital staff into a community of lay brothers for whom he drew up appropriate constitutions which were approved in 1113 by Pope Paschal II. The fraternity became known as the Hospitallers of St. John, after the patron saint of the church which was attached to the hospital. This patron was St. John the Almoner, Patriarch of Alexandria, who had provided the means for rebuilding the churches of the Resurrection and of Calvary in Jerusalem. Later the Hospitallers adopted the better known St. John the Baptist as their patron saint.

Whereas Gerard was the founder of the Order of St. John, his successor Raymond du Puy, a knight from Provence, became its organizer. While he was Master of the Hospital (1120-60), the community, although continuing its hospital work, began also to engage in services of a military character. The military duties

[1] F. Giraud, *Le Bienheureux Gérard* (Aix, 1919); Carlo Guarmani, *Gli Italiani in Terra Santa, reminiscenze e ricerche storiche* (Bologna, 1872), pp. 28-29. E. J. King, *The Knights Hospitallers in the Holy Land* (London: Methuen, 1939, p. 20), says that the theory that Gerard's surname was Tonce or that he hailed from Tonco is based on "the error of some copyist of a Latin text, who seeing the words 'Gerardus tunc' mistook the adverb for a surname."

consisted at first in providing armed protection for the sick and the poor and military escorts for the pilgrims. Soon the brotherhood took part in the defense of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem and in the battles against the Moslems and thus became a full-fledged military order. But the order never forsook its humble beginnings; its militarization only added a new objective to its activities, as expressed in the age-old motto: *Obsequium pauperum et tuitio fidei*—service of the poor and protection of the faith.

During the process of militarization three classes of brothers developed: the knights who led in the fighting and held most of the higher administrative functions at headquarters and in the other houses of the order; the chaplains who took care of the spiritual needs of the other members of the order and of the patients in the hospitals; the sergeants-at-arms, who were the serving brothers. In the beginning, persons not belonging to the military aristocracy or nobility could enter the class of knights, but as from Master Hugh Revel (1258-77) the rule was laid down that such as desired to be admitted as knights should prove nobility on both father's and mother's side. When occasionally a few knights were received into the order who were not fully qualified with regard to their armorial bearings, they were called Knights-of-Grace (admitted by favor) in contrast to the duly qualified members who were called Knights-of-Justice, a distinction which has prevailed until recently.

The number of professed knights was always quite limited, scarcely in excess of 500 or 600 knights. Since the order was essentially a lay organization, the number of professed priests always remained very small. The professed chaplains served mainly in the Convent, that is, the general headquarters of the order, and were therefore called Conventual Chaplains. The *cura animarum* in the houses outside the Convent was for the most part exercised by priests who did not belong to the order, but were engaged by the order according to its needs; since they were throughout the time of office under the jurisdiction of the grand master they were called Chaplains of Magistral Obedience.

The professed sergeants-at-arms assisted the knights; they were at first quite important and numerous but eventually almost completely faded out of the picture, being replaced by hired help. In fact, the knights employed a considerable number of men for

all their enterprises, both charitable and military: physicians and other personnel in the hospital were engaged on a paid basis, the soldiers who formed the body of the order's army were mercenary troops as were the sailors on their fleet in the days of Rhodes and Malta.

At the top of this hierarchical pyramid stood the Master. His official title, ever since the days of Blessed Gerard, was Master of the Hospital. Although often referred to, even in earlier days, as the Grand Master, he did not formally assume the latter title until 1489. After the order had settled on Malta, the Grand Master Alof de Wignacourt (1601-1622) was given the title of prince of the Holy Roman Empire by the Emperor and the Pope bestowed on him and his successors a rank equal to a Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church with the title of Eminence. Besides these sonorous titles, the grand master, like all other professed members of the order, also uses the religious title Frà (Brother) which is put before his baptismal name. To date there have been seventy-six grand masters.

The monastic habit of the order was a wide black cassock with a slit on each side for the arms. In the days of Blessed Gerard a plain white cross was sewn on the breast; Master Raymond introduced the eight-pointed white cross which has become the emblem of the order down to the present day. Since these bell-like cloaks were rather cumbersome in battle, Pope Innocent IV in 1248 granted the knights permission to wear a black surcoat over armour when on active service. Pope Alexander IV in 1259 changed the color of this tunic to red, with a plain white cross. The choir dress of the professed knights is even at present a black mantle with the Maltese cross and a very elaborate maniple.

The headquarters of the order, wherever they might be, in Jerusalem, Acre, Rhodes or Malta, were called the Convent. In its developed form this Convent consisted of the palace of the grand master, the living quarters of the knights and their assistants, the stables for the horses, the church and the hospital.

Even by modern standards the hospital in Jerusalem was quite large; Master Roger des Moulins in a letter of 1178 puts the number of patients at 950. According to the statutes of 1182, the medical staff consisted of four physicians and a number of male nurses. Special regulations were laid down concerning hygiene.

A wise rule was that each patient, after admittance, should hand over his valuables to the hospital authorities so as to prevent protests and reclamations in case of loss or theft. A religious in charge registered all the belongings of a patient and gave them back after he was dismissed. The statutes of the hospital in Jerusalem served as a model for, and sometimes were literally copied by, other hospital organizations in the Middle Ages.[2]

In view of the fact that before the crusades hospitals in the more modern sense of the word hardly existed, the charity work of the Knights of St. John—and to a lesser extent that of the other orders founded in the Holy Land—has been hailed as a kind of innovation. Historians agree that the Hospitallers must be credited with having created the hospital in the organized sense.

Whenever the knights of St. John had to transfer their Convent, they considered it one of their first duties to attach to it a well-equipped hospital for "our lords the sick." The hospital in Rhodes, restored by the Italian government under Mussolini to its original condition, was a large and beautiful building. On Malta the hospital or "Sacra Infirmeria" developed into a center for medical sciences, particularly surgery and ophthalmology.

The militarization of the order had a double effect. Knights from every country in Europe enrolled under the red banner with the white cross. At the same time the military reputation of the order greatly increased the number of donations and legacies which had been given already at the time the order was devoted to charity work. These possessions scattered throughout the Near East and Europe called for administration and management. Although the supervisory system was very complicated and only gradually developed, it may be said in general that the order was divided in bailiwicks and priories which were roughly equivalent to provinces in other orders and each priory comprised a number of commanderies. The house of a commander might be a manor, a castle, a walled-in-portion or a fortified church with an annex. Each house contained, besides the chapel and the living quarters

[2] See C. Fedeli, *L'ordine di Malta e le scienze mediche* (Pisa, 1913); Hans Karl von Zwehl, *Ueber die Caritas im Johanniter-Malteser Orden seit seiner Gründung* (Essen: Fredebeul und Koenen, 1929); Edgar Erskine Hume, *Medieval Work of the Knights Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1940).

for the household, a number of rooms, to be used as a ward for travellers and as a hospital for sick pilgrims.[3]

The functions of the priors and commanders were manifold: they collected the revenues of the estates of the order, they gave protection to the pilgrims, occasionally they built or maintained roads and bridges and their "mansiones" were recruiting stations for the order. When the days of the great pilgrimages were over, several hospices of St. John grew into regular hospitals.

The territorial organization of the order achieved its final completion, when it was divided into *langues* or tongues. When the headquarters of the order were in Rhodes and Malta, the knights of each *langue* lived together in their own residence, called *auberge* or inn, so that the Convent consisted of a number of national "monasteries."

Although the training of the Knights of St. John was mainly aimed at making them good fighters—a life not particularly conducive to sanctity—yet the chronicles of the order boast a number of men and women noted for their holiness. To mention a few: Gerard, the Founder, and Raymond du Puy, who have been always revered as Blessed; St. Hugh, Commander of Geneva; the sergeant-at-arms Blessed Gerard Mercati who, however, died as a Franciscan; and the most renowned among the women saints, St. Ubaldescha, St. Toscana and St. Fiora of Beaulieu.[4]

The military and political history of the Order of St. John is an eight-hundred-years-long Odyssey which can be best characterized as the road from Jerusalem to Rome by way of Acre, Rhodes, Malta, and a number of other places, including a curious detour by Russia. The Hospitallers stayed in the Holy Land for almost two centuries, until 1291; they then had their headquarters on the island of Rhodes for another two hundred years (1309-1522), and afterwards transferred to the island of Malta for two centuries and a half (1530-1798), finally moving to Rome in 1834.[5]

[3] For a description of the provincial organization of the Hospitallers see Elizabeth Wheeler Schermerhorn, *On the Trail of the Eight-pointed Cross* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1940).

[4] A. Bosio, *Les vies des Saints de l'Ordre de St. Jean de Jéruzalem* (Paris: Baudoin, 1631); Mathieu de Goussancourt, *Martyrologe des Chevaliers de St. Jean, dits de Malte*, 2 vols. (Paris: F. Noel, 1643).

[5] E. Rossi, *Riassunto storico del S. M. Ordine San Giovanni in Gerusalemme, di Rodi e di Malta* (Rome, 1926); C. Bottarelli-M. Monterisi,

In the Palestinian period the Hospitallers fought for the defense of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem; together with the Templars they supplied the best-trained and disciplined troops and, especially in the times of disaster, their forces were the most stable and reliable. During the last forty years of the kingdom the defense of the country rested almost completely upon these two military orders.[6]

In the armies of the Christians in the Holy Land the knights formed a sort of division, composed of between 300 and 500 knights and a number of hired soldiers. This division was sometimes used as a flank, but more often as a vanguard or rear guard. Besides, the knights built and garrisoned an impressive number of fortresses of which the most powerful were Margat and Crac.

Only seven knights of St. John, including the master, survived the fall of Acre in 1291. They found asylum on the island of Cyprus. During their years there, the knights began to build up a naval force. With this they conquered the island of Rhodes, where they were firmly established in 1308. Thus they became known as Knights of Rhodes.[7]

At Rhodes the knights reached the peak of power and influence, never quite attained in the same measure before or after. And this is all the more remarkable because the number of knights on the island never exceeded three hundred. By building enormous fortifications they made the island an almost impregnable bastion against the attacks of the Mamelukes of Egypt and Syria and the Turks of Constantinople. With their naval power they started a new type of warfare against the old enemies. In Rhodes the knights became a sovereign power like the sea republics of Italy or the Hanseatic cities in Germany.[8] Their navy flew its own flag,

---

Storia politica e militare del Sovrano Ordine di S. Giovanni di Gerusalemme, 2 Vols. (Milan, 1940); Giacomo C. Bascapé, "Historic Summary of the Sovereign Military Order of St. John of Jerusalem and Malta," in: *The Official General Roll of the Grand Magistery* (Milan: Ciarrocca, 1949), pp. 17-61.

[6] For this period see Edwin J. King, *The Knights Hospitallers in the Holy Land* (London: Methuen, 1930).

[7] Hans Prutz, "Die Anfänge der Hospitaler auf Rhodes," *Sitzungsbericht der Königlichen Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften,* Jg. 1908, Abh. 1,

[8] Giacomo C. Bascapé, *L'ordine Sovrano di Malta e gli Ordini Equestri della Chiesa nella storia e nel diritto* (Milan, 1941).

a white cross on a red field, they minted their own money, they concluded treaties with other sovereign states on the basis of equality and they had their diplomatic representatives at many courts. After repulsing numerous attacks, the knights finally were overwhelmed by a strong expeditionary force under Sultan Soliman I and capitulated Dec. 21, 1522.

Once again the remaining knights drifted around in search of a dwelling place; they established their capital successively in Crete, Messina, Baia, Viterbo, and Nizza. Finally, on March 24, 1530, they obtained from Emperor Charles V, in his capacity as king of Sicily, the island of Malta and adjacent islands as a "perpetual and free feud." The only obligation attached to this transfer was that the knights should annually, on the feast of All Saints, offer a falcon or a hawk to the King of Sicily, whoever he might be. Thus the Order of Saint John became a feudatory of the kingdom of Sicily territorially, but as a religious order it continued dependent on the authority of the Holy See. From their key position in the Mediterranean, the knights watched the movements of the Turkish fleet and engaged in battle the corsairs from Tripoli and the other Barbary States. Twice a year the order equipped a "caravan," namely a naval expedition, to ferret out pirates along the coastline of the Mediterranean. As in Rhodes, in Malta the knights sustained several attacks from the Turks, the most memorable of which was the "Great Siege" (1565). The knights were victorious on all occasions. However, in the eighteenth century a decline in spirit and in discipline set in. What the Turks failed to achieve, Napoleon did; on his way to Egypt, without striking a blow he captured the fortress of Malta, believed to be impregnable (June 12, 1798). The weak Grand Master Ferdinand von Hompesch soon resigned and the order established a provisional headquarters at Trieste which at the time was under Austria.

A peculiar situation then arose: an orthodox emperor made himself Grand Master of this thoroughly Catholic Order of St. John. Paul I of Russia, who for some time had in mind using the Hospitallers and their island bastion for political purposes, had managed to establish a grand priory in Russia. The Russian knights in 1798 elected Paul as Grand Master, but he died in 1801 without being able to do anything on behalf of the order. With England taking Malta from the French in 1800, the old capital was lost for good.

Upon the loss of Malta the order reached the lowest point in all its glorious history. The order's headquarters shifted from Messina to Catania to Ferrara and finally in 1834 they were established in Rome. The knights had one more grand master after Paul I, but when he died in 1805, the Pope allowed them only to elect lieutenant grand masters who were to be ratified by him. This state of affairs continued for seventy-four years until Leo XIII by a Bull of March 29, 1879, re-established the office of grand master with headquarters in Rome.[9]

From then on the order regained part of its old vitality. It had lost its territorial sovereignty, military activities had ceased, but it now reverted to its original objective: *obsequium pauperum.* The order became again a welfare and charity organization. Looking back over its long history one might say that at first its master was the superintendent of a hospital, then he became a commanding army general (to which office he subsequently added that of an admiral), and in this age the grand master has become the president of an international Catholic White Cross which at times collaborates with the international Red Cross.

The order has built and maintains an impressive number of hospitals—in Italy alone there are 19 with a total of 5,290 beds; it takes care of a number of children's homes, child centers and trade schools for abandoned children. During the two world wars, the order established military hospitals and had a number of ambulance trains and airplanes for the transport of wounded soldiers; in catastrophes such as earthquakes or other disasters it provides food and medical help. It also extends financial and medical assistance to the Catholic foreign missions.[10]

Expenses involved in these activities are paid out of the revenues from the remaining properties of the order and the contributions of its members throughout the world.

The present organization of the Order of Malta consists of three large categories, each subdivided into a number of ranks.[11] They

[9] Michel de Pierredon, *Histoire politique de l'Ordre Souverain des Hospitaliers de Saint-Jean de Jéruzalem, dit de Malta, depuis la chute de Malte jusqu'à nos jours* (Poitiers: Imprimérie du Poiton, 1926).

[10] E. Nasalli Rocca di Corneliano, "Lineamenti dell'organizzazione regionale e della funzione assistenziale dell'Ordine," in: *Studi in onore di C. Calisse* (Milan, 1939).

[11] For an excellent survey in five languages of the division, degrees, emblems and uniforms of the order see Rudolf Prokopowski, *Ordre Souverain*

are the Knights of Justice, who take the three monastic vows and form the strictly religious nucleus of the order; the Knights of Honour and Devotion who are required to furnish proof of ancient nobility; the Knights of Magistral Grace who are affiliated to the order and are somewhat reminiscent of the old class of sergeants-at-arms. Besides, there are three other groups: the Chaplains, Dames of Honour and Devotion, and the Donates. The grand master may bestow on persons outside the order the Cross of Merit of the Order of Malta, an honour which may be conferred also on non-Catholics and consists of five classes.

The Order of Malta is divided into five grand priories and fourteen national associations, including the "Association of Master Knights of the Sovereign Military Order of Malta in the United States of America." Those knights who do not belong to any of the priories or associations depend directly on the grand master and are called *Knights in Gremio Religionis.*[12]

The Order of St. John, although deprived of its territory, retains its sovereign character. The palace of the grand master and the other houses in Rome are extra-territorial, that is to say enjoy the same privilege as that accorded to the other foreign embassies and legations; the order issues its own diplomatic passports and entertains diplomatic missions and legations in several countries.[13]

Recently the legal status of the Order of Malta in the Church has been defined with greater precision. Pope Pius XII, on Dec. 10, 1951, appointed a special tribunal of five cardinals, presided over by the Dean of the Sacred College, Cardinal Eugene Tisserant, in order to determine the nature of the order and the extent of its competence both as a sovereign and as a religious institution, as well as its relationship to the Holy See. After long discussions the commission of cardinals on Jan. 24, 1953, gave the following unanimous verdict:[14]

The Order of Malta is a sovereign order, inasmuch as it enjoys certain prerogatives which, according to the principles of interna-

---

et Militaire Jérosclymitain de Malte (Vatican City: Éditions "Ecclesia," 1950).

[12] See for membership of the order: *The Official General Roll of the Grand Magistery* (Milan: Ciarrocca, 1949).

[13] A. Visconti, "La sovranità dell'Ordine di Malta nel diritto italiano," *Rivista di diritto privato,* VI (1936), 195-205.

[14] *AAS,* XXXV (1953), 765-67.

tional law, are proper to sovereignty. These rights have been recognized by the Holy See and a number of states. However, these rights do not comprise all the powers and prerogatives that belong to sovereign states in the full sense of the word.

Insofar as the Order of Malta is composed of knights and chaplains, it is a "religio" and more precisely a religious order, approved by the Holy See, according to the *Codex juris canonici,* Can. 487 and 488, nn. 1 and 2. The purpose of this order is, besides the sanctification of its members, also the pursuit of religious objectives, charity, and welfare work.

The sovereign and the religious character of the order are intimately related, inasmuch as the former serves to attain the objectives of the order as a religious institution and its development in the world.

The Order of Malta depends on the Holy See and, as a religious order, on the Sacred Congregation of Religious.

Those persons who have obtained marks of distinction from the order and the associations of these persons depend on the order, and, through it, on the Holy See.

Questions concerning the institution's character as a sovereign order are treated by the Secretariat of State of His Holiness. Those of a mixed nature are received by the Sacred Congregation of Religious in accord with the Secretariat of State.

The present decisions do not interfere with the order's acquired rights, customs and privileges which the Popes have granted or recognized, inasfar as they are still in force according to the norms of canon law[15] and the order's own constitutions.[16]

THE ORDER OF THE TEUTONIC KNIGHTS

The origin of the Order of the Teutonic Knights was practically the same as that of the Order of Saint John: the Teutonic Order sprang from a fraternity of lay men engaged in charitable work. A number of crusaders from Bremen and Lübeck in Germany,

[15] *Codex juris canonici,* can. 4 and 5; can. 25-30; can. 63-79.

[16] One of the most extensive collections in the United States dealing with the Knights of Malta is to be found in the Library of The Catholic University of America. The collection was assembled by Mr. Foster Stearns who in 1955 entrusted it to The Catholic University. The Library has prepared a catalog classifying the 281 titles which include imprints from 1480 to the present day.

under the leadership of a certain Meister Sigebrand, operated a field hospital during the dreadful winter of the Siege of Acre (1190 A.D.), when the Christian army through famine and sickness was almost decimated. Pope Clement III, recognizing the remarkable services of the confraternity, gave it his approbation in 1191; the first superior of this religious congregation was Conrad, chaplain of Fredrick of Swabia. During the next eight years a number of German knights joined, and the community gradually assumed the character of a military order of knighthood, becoming known as the Teutonic Knights of the Hospital of Saint Mary of Jerusalem. The Pope approved the Order in 1199 with Henry Walpott of Bossenheim as first master. The new order was organized along the same lines as the Hospitallers; it comprised professed knights, priests and lay brothers and its purpose was to care for the poor and the sick as well as to wage war against the foes of Christendom. Like the Hospitallers, the knights followed the Augustinian rule, but whereas the former wore a black mantle with a white cross, the Teutonic Knights adopted a white mantle with a black cross. Only German candidates were eligible for the new order, which rapidly grew in numbers and influence. This may have been due to the fact that the German knights, always resentful of the predominantly Latin influence in the existing military orders, were only too happy to have an organization of their own and thus gave it strong support. The fourth Master, Hermann of Salza (1210-1239), shifted the military activities of his order from Palestine, first to Hungary, and then to the northeastern frontier of Germany, where the order engaged in fighting the heathen Prussians. But although the Knights operated mainly in Prussia, their general headquarters still continued at Acre, until the latter fell in 1291, after which they transferred to Venice. Finally, in 1309, the seat of the order was established in the famous fortress of Marienburg in Prussia.[17]

In 1236 the Teutonic Order absorbed the remnants of the Brothers of the Sword, an order of knighthood which had been founded some thirty-four years earlier for the purpose of subjugating and christianizing the peoples of the Baltic countries of Livonia,

[17] For the history of the Teutonic Order, see Arbogast Reiterer, O.T., *Das Deutsche Kreuz, Geschichte des Deutschen Ritterorders* (Graz, 1922).

Lettonia and Esthonia (now known as Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia).

Thus the Teutonic Knights prevailed in these countries. By donations and conquest the knights gradually increased their holdings, until they included large parts of Prussia, Kurland and Lithuania. Although these followers of Christ used the unorthodox methods of fire and sword for the propagation of the faith, it cannot be denied that they greatly contributed to the pacification and civilization of the peoples under their jurisdiction. They encouraged cultivation of the land and built a great number of towns and villages, providing each with a church. In some places they erected schools and, faithful to the original purpose of their order, they established hundreds of hospitals and hospices. In this respect it is worthy of note that the Teutonic Knights were the first to establish a mental hospital (Dollhaus) in Germany, namely at Elbig in 1316. The knights also proved to be clever businessmen inasmuch as they sponsored profitable markets in foreign countries for the produce of their land.

For more than a century after the final subjugation of the Prussians in 1283, the Teutonic Knights were the undisputed rulers of a vast and well-organized domain that stretched along the coast of the Baltic Sea, from the river Oder to Leningrad. The grand master, residing in his fortified convent of Marienburg and then from 1457 on at Königsburg, was *de jure et de facto* a sovereign, equal to the other princes of the Empire, and only nominally subordinate to the Emperor. But in the fifteenth century decline set in. The first blow was struck in 1410, when in the battle of Tannenberg the Knights were overthrown by the Polish troops. In 1525 the Order received the *coup de grâce;* its grand master Albrecht of Brandenburg embraced the Protestant religion, secularized the possessions of the Order in East Prussia which once he had vowed to protect, and styled himself Duke of Prussia.[18] When later this duchy was united with Brandenburg, the foundations were laid for the kingdom of Prussia and eventually for the German Reich of the Hohenzollerns. In 1561, when Gotthard Kettler, "Landmeister" of Livonia, followed Albrecht's apostasy,

[18] E. Joachim, *Die Politik des letzten Hochmeisters in Preuszen, Albrecht von Brandenburg,* 3 Vols. (Publikationen aus dem K. Preuszichen Staatsarchive, 1892-1895).

the Teutonic Order ceased to be a sovereign power. However, the loss of sovereignty did not mean the end of the Teutonic Order, for—although a skeleton of its former glory—it still possessed large estates and strongholds in Western Germany. (During the Reformation the Teutonic Knights in the Netherlands separated themselves from their Catholic brethren. This Protestant branch was suppressed by Napoleon but was re-established at the time of the Restoration and is known as the bailiwick of Utrecht.) After the loss of Prussia the general head of the order became known as "Hoch-und Deutsch Meister" (Grand-and Teutonic Master). From 1590 on, these grand masters were almost without exception members of the imperial house of Hapsburg, which meant that the former independent Teutonic Order became more and more an appendix of the Austrian crown. Nevertheless, the order was not completely secularized. True, community life soon ceased to exist, but the knights still took religious vows. The next blow was dealt by Napoleon, who suppressed the Teutonic Order in Germany and confiscated its possessions. The order was now restricted to the confines of the Austrian empire. Around 1839, attempts were made to revive the languishing order by dedicating its members—priests and professed knights—to its original objective, namely ambulance service and works of charity. Besides, the professed knights, instead of fighting the infidels, took upon themselves the obligation of serving as officers in the Austrian army.

The question of profession was settled by a papal indult in 1886 (*Neminem profecto latet,* March 16, 1886), according to which the knights of the Teutonic Order were to take simple perpetual vows which, however, included the same rights and obligations as solemn vows.

When the Hapsburg dynasty fell after the first World War, only a handful of knights were left. On April 30, 1923, the grand master Eugene, Archduke of Hapsburg-Lothringen, commander in chief of the Austrian forces on the Italian front in World War I, resigned and was succeeded by Bishop Norbert Klein.

In 1929 a radical change took place in the entire structure of the order. The erstwhile military order of the Teutonic Knights was transformed into a religious community of priests and lay-brothers with solemn vows similar to any other religious congregation in the Catholic Church. It assumed the title of *Ordo*

Teutonicus Sanctae Mariae in Jeruzalem (officially designated by the initials O.T.) and is listed in the *Annuario pontificio* as a mendicant order. This new community—with a very old past—devotes itself to parish work and works of charity; it is divided into five provinces (Austria, Bavaria, Italy, Yugoslavia and the practically extinct province of Czechoslovakia) with a total membership of 93, of whom 70 are priests. (See the *Catalogus ordinis teutonici,* Jan. 1, 1950). A congregation of sisters is affiliated to the Order, also divided into five provinces with a total membership of 572, mostly dedicated to hospital work.

The superior general has the old title of Grand Master (Hochmeister, Supremus Magister); he has abbatial rank and enjoys the privilege of the *pileolus violaceus.* So far his residence is in Vienna, Austria. The professed knights of the old guard who were still alive when the transformation was effected became members of the new outfit with the title of Ordensritter (Knights of the Order). Since the last grand master, Eugene of Hapsburg, died in January, 1955, only one of the old knights is left. It is all that remained of an order which at one time counted its knights by the hundreds. However, as a remnant of the old prerogatives, the new Teutonic Order has the right to bestow knighthood on eminent Catholic men, either lay or clerical, and on great benefactors of the order. These honorary knights are called *familiares.* Before 1952 the order had made use of this privilege in only three cases.

(*To be continued*)

JAMES VAN DER VELDT, O.F.M.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

THE HOLY FATHER'S STATEMENT ON RELATIONS BETWEEN THE CHURCH AND THE STATE

In its *Analecta* section the present issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* carries the English translation of the discourse delivered on Sept. 7 of this year by the Sovereign Pontiff to the tenth International Congress of Historical Sciences. This discourse contains a highly important section on the relations between the Church and the state. What the Holy Father had to say on this subject must certainly be normative for all future teaching and writing on Church-state relations by Catholics.

The discourse explains the existence of relations between the Church and the state by the fact that Our Lord handed over to His kingdom on earth, the Church militant of the New Testament, the direction of men in the religious and moral domain which had, in pre-Christian times, fallen within the competence of civil authority itself. So it came about that an individual man became subject to two different and independent authorities, the state, which was responsible for his temporal welfare, and the Church, the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, which was made responsible for the salvation of his soul, and which was given full competence in this religious sphere.

Thus, in the realistic and outspoken teaching of the Holy Father, the genuine and objective relation of the Catholic Church to the state is definitely not placed on the same level as that of the relations between other religious societies and the civil authority. A religious society which God has neither founded nor commissioned can deal with the state only in the capacity of a voluntary organization. The most it can say for itself is that it is a group of men gathered together and organized for a religious purpose. It can demand or petition the civil authority to take cognizance of and to respect the intentions of its members. Whatever influence it exercises on its own members can proceed only from some agreement made with or promise made to the society itself by its individual members.

The Holy Father's discourse to the historians shows that the Catholic Church approaches the state from a completely different angle. The Church appears as a society actually instituted by Our Lord during the course of His public life on earth. Furthermore,

it speaks with the certain knowledge that Our Lord actually gave it, and it alone, genuine authority within the field of religion. Like the state itself, the Catholic Church is a society that can issue commands or make laws which impose a definite and serious obligation on its own subjects. Objectively, disobedience to the laws or the commands of ecclesiastical authority constitutes a sin in the eyes of God Himself, just as disobedience to just civil law is objectively sinful. And the Catholic Church possesses this prerogative by reason of God's own decree and decision. In no way does this power come to it as something conceded by the state, or by mere human custom or tradition.

The Holy Father insists also that the Catholic Church, like the state itself, "possesses a sovereign right to all she needs to attain her end, even over material means." Once again, that right comes to the Church from God Himself. It is definitely not something granted by any merely human authority. Actually the religious field lies, by God's own decree, within the competence of the Catholic Church and not within the competence of any other society or authority. In explaining this point, the Holy Father quotes a famous passage from the encyclical *Immortale Dei,* issued by Pope Leo XIII Nov. 1, 1885. "Whatever, therefore, in things human is of a sacred character, whatever belongs either of its own nature or by reason of the end to which it is referred, to the salvation of souls, or to the worship of God, is subject to the power and judgment of the Church."

The discourse goes on to explain that the Catholic Church and the state, as sovereign and independent societies, both endowed by God with authority over their subjects, should not ignore one another or combat one another. He insists that "it is far more in conformity to nature and to the Divine Will if they co-operate in mutual understanding." Such co-operation is requisite "since their activities apply to the same subject, namely to the Catholic citizen." It is to be noted that Pope Pius XII insists that it is right that the Catholic Church and the state should co-operate, actively work together, for the well-being of those persons who are members of both societies and thus subject to the laws of both. The obligation, as the Holy Father has described it, is incumbent upon the authorities of both the state and the Church.

One of the most interesting statements in the discourse is that in which the Holy Father takes cognizance of the possibility of

discord between the power of the Catholic Church and that of the state. This happens "when the laws of the state infringe upon the divine law." In such cases, according to the Holy Father, "the Church has the moral obligation to oppose" such laws.

With these words the Sovereign Pontiff expresses the Catholic teaching, traditional in the textbooks of theology and of public ecclesiastical law, on the superiority of the Church over the state. Both of these societies are sovereign and independent. They are not, however, equal. The Church, by reason of the superiority of its commission and of its ultimate goal, is actually superior to the state. The Church has the power to oppose an immoral enactment made by the civil authority. Thus it has obviously the competence to pronounce such an enactment immoral. And, where there is such a conflict of authority, that of the Church is able and morally obliged to speak out.

The laws by which the Catholic Church directs and binds all its subjects cannot be opposed to God's law. The divine Founder of the Church, dwelling within it, according to His promise, cannot allow and will not allow His Mystical Body to direct men away from the goal God has set for them. Thus there is no case in which the civil authority or anyone else could be obligated to oppose the law of the Catholic Church, or even justified in opposing it.

In his discourse, the Holy Father speaks of the teaching he has thus far set forth on the relations between the Catholic Church and the state as having been set forth by his illustrious predecessor, Pope Leo XIII. He mentions the fact that Pope Leo had expressed the basic truth about the nature of these relations in a formula: "The two powers, the Church and the state, are sovereign. Their nature, and the end they seek, fix the limits within which they govern *iure proprio*. Like the state, the Church also possesses a sovereign right to all it needs, even material means, to attain its goal."

The Holy Father adds that Pope Leo "gives an enlightening explanation" of this basic truth or formula "in his encyclicals *Diuturnum illud, Immortale Dei,* and *Sapientiae christianae.*" In the comparatively few paragraphs which he devotes to the subject of Church-state relations in his discourse to the historical congress, Pope Pius XII does not mention explicitly the greater part of the "enlightening explanation" of the formula contained in the three documents to which he alludes. Yet this assertion about the three encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII cannot be interpreted as other than

a complete acceptance and confirmation of what they have to say in explaining the consequences or implications of the basic truths about the interrelations of the Catholic Church and the state.

The discourse pauses at this point to indicate another concept of the state which was current among some Catholics during the Middle Ages. It quotes a statement by Pope Boniface VIII to the envoys of a German king to the effect that "as the moon has no light apart from that which it receives from the sun, so no earthly power has anything except what it receives from the ecclesiastical power. . . . All powers . . . are from Christ and from us, as the Vicar of Jesus Christ."

According to the concept set forth in this statement by Pope Boniface VIII, the state would not appear to be completely sovereign and independent of the Church authority. Thus the mentality expressed in this assertion of Pope Boniface VIII is not in line with what has been taught by Pope Leo XIII and by the present Holy Father. The discourse, however, makes three distinct and highly important statements about this mediaeval mentality, set forth in the pronouncement by Pope Boniface.

(1) There is the statement that many, even during the course of the approximately five-hundred years when this mediaeval concept of the origin or source of civil authority was prevalent, did not accept it. Indeed, according to the Holy Father, the men who held the traditional teaching about the origin of civil power may well have been in the majority even during that period. In other words, this was never Catholic teaching. It could not be said that at any time it was Catholic doctrine that the power of the state was derived from and was dependent upon ecclesiastical authority.

(2) Even in its most emphatic statement by Pope Boniface VIII, this "mediaeval" theory about the origin of civil power was not so absolute as some of the opponents of the Church have tried to make it appear. Pope Boniface himself and, ordinarily, those who had this concept of the origin of civil authority were speaking of the power as such, and not of the designation of the individuals who were to exercise that power in the state.

(3) The Holy Father asserts that "this mediaeval conception [of the origin or source of civil authority] was conditioned by the times," and that "those who know its sources will probably admit

that it would undoubtedly have been even more astonishing had it not appeared."

In what way could the epoch or the times have "conditioned" the concept of the origin of state authority during the course of the Middle Ages? There is a rather obvious answer to this question. During the period preceding the reign of Pope Boniface VIII, the emperors themselves had been crowned by the Popes. In theory (although obviously not in actual practice) the emperors possessed the supreme civil authority in the mediaeval world. Ordinarily, at least, the kings and the other potentates were likewise somewhat dependent in fact upon ecclesiastical approbation and support.

Such was, *de facto,* the situation of the mediaeval world, although it was a situation realized much more completely under Innocent III than under Boniface VIII. The mediaeval culture, which, incidentally, Pope Pius XII reminds us in this same discourse, was definitely not *the* Catholic culture, worked in that way. When Pope Boniface spoke as he did, he was describing a situation which, as a matter of fact, had existed for many years before his time, and which was, theoretically, supposed to be in existence when his words were uttered. It is obvious then that, to a certain extent, it would have been astonishing had conceptions such as that set forth by Pope Boniface VIII not been set forth.

Under the circumstances, then, the statement of Pope Boniface should be seen in the light of the actual political and cultural situation in existence during the mediaeval period. As far as the dependence of civil authority on that of Christ the King is concerned, what Pope Boniface had to say was perfectly correct. There is nothing in legitimate civil authority that does not come from Our Lord. As far as its dependence upon the Roman Pontiff is concerned, this was *de facto* true to a certain extent at least in the mediaeval political and cultural outlook. It has no value in terms of the state, and of the Church, as such. What might be verified of a mediaeval state could be explained by the fact that it was mediaeval, and not by reason of the fact that it was a state.

The mention of the Middle Ages in the discourse leads to some brief statements about the Church and freedom of religious convictions. According to the Holy Father, the historians who know about the Church will perhaps concede that "from the time of the Apostles to our own day, her [the Church's] efforts to remain independent of the civil power have always looked to safeguarding

the freedom of religious convictions." Taking account of the possibility that some might advance the objection that the Church despises the religious convictions of people who disagree with it, the Holy Father brings out four points about the Church's attitude toward those not of its own fold.

(1) The Church has considered and still considers the voluntary abandonment of the true faith to be a sin. This statement by Pope Pius XII repeats the teaching set forth in the constitution *Dei Filius* of the Vatican Council.

(2) The reason for the penalties inflicted on men who abandoned the true faith in past times by both the ecclesiastical and the civil authorities was the desire to prevent the breaking up of the religious and ecclesiastical unity of the West.

This statement by the Holy Father in no way constitutes a defense of the numerous inquisitions operating in mediaeval and post-mediaeval times. It is a simple assertion of the reason that motivated the imposition of penalties. It does not say that the penalties themselves were always just, or that they were applied properly in all cases.

(3) The Church has always forbidden and will always forbid forcing people to accept the Catholic faith. This is, and always has been, a cardinal principle of Catholic law and teaching.

(4) The Church considers the religious convictions of non-Catholics a reason, although not always the principal reason, for tolerance. The Pope refers at this point to his allocution *Ci riesce*, delivered Dec. 6, 1953.

The last paragraph of the section of this discourse devoted to the relations between the Catholic Church and the state deals with the subject of concordats, and again refers to the *Ci riesce*. The next-to-the-last paragraph, however, develops the Holy Father's teaching on the co-operation that should exist between the Church and the state. It is by all means the most important paragraph in the text.

The paragraph begins with this statement: "The historian should not forget that, while the Church and the state have known hours and years of conflict, there were also, from the time of Constantine the Great until the contemporary, and even the recent period, tranquil times, often long, during which they collaborated with full understanding in the education of the same people." It continues: "The Church does not hide the fact that in principle it considers

this collaboration as normal, and that it regards as an ideal the unity of the people in the true religion and the unanimity of action between itself and the state."

Here the Holy Father restates in a clear and forthright manner one of the basic teachings set forth by Pope Leo XIII in the encyclicals to which he refers in his discourse. The collaboration of the Church and the state (or of the state with the Church) is something which, according to the Roman Pontiff, the Church regards as normal in principle. The Church makes no secret of the fact that in principle it considers the kind of co-operation between itself and the state that has existed for long periods in times past as not merely good, but as normal. In other words, in the light of this declaration by the Holy Father, had the states that collaborated with the Church during these long tranquil periods withheld that co-operation, their conduct would have been abnormal and faulty.

It is to be noted that the Church considers such intimate and cordial collaboration as normal "in principle." It is not, in other words, something which might merely be considered good for only one kind of a state, one, for instance, in a "sacral" culture or civilization. It is a good in itself. When it is absent, that absence stems from something regrettable, either the unwillingness of a Catholic state to co-operate with the Church or the failure on the part of the majority of the people in a state to acknowledge Our Lord and His Church.

Likewise it is interesting to note that what is set forth as normal in principle is a collaboration of the Church and of the state "with full understanding for the education of the same people," such as has actually been found frequently in the course of the Church's history. Thus it could not be said that any Catholic state, democratic or otherwise, would be doing its duty, would be acting according to the objective norm, if its collaboration consisted only in guaranteeing the freedom of the Catholic Church by generally guaranteeing the freedom of religion. What is normal in principle is the collaboration of the Catholic Church and the state, a collaboration which is cordial and thorough, in the education of the same people. By reason of its divine institution and by reason of the commission it alone has received from Our Lord, the Catholic Church should have this cordial and thorough co-operation from a state whose citizenry is Catholic.

The paragraph goes on to say that the Church does not make any secret of the fact that "it regards as an ideal the unity of the people in the true religion and the unanimity of action between itself and the state." The ideal is the objective of the Church's prayer and work. It is the Church's desire, motivated by the charity that animates it as the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, that all men may believe the divine message which her Divine Founder has entrusted to her, and that they may be joined to Our Lord in the unity of His Kingdom on earth. It is likewise the will of the Church that, because such action is normal and good, the state composed of Catholics should co-operate sincerely and effectively with the Church.

It is the ideal, the objective toward which we should work and hope and pray, that all people should be joined to Our Lord in His Mystical Body. That ideal, however, has not been attained. The Church, in the words of the Holy Father, professes itself quite well aware of the fact that "for some time events have been evolving rather in a different direction, that is, toward the multiplicity of religious confessions and concepts of life within the same national community, where Catholics are a more or less strong minority." This is, of course, a tendency away from the ideal. It is, in itself, definitely not a good thing to have more and more people fail to accept Our Lord in His Mystical Body.

Nevertheless, the Church can flourish even in countries where the populace is not Catholic and where there is no special collaboration between the state and the Catholic Church. The Catholics of our own country may well be proud of the fact that, in his discourse, the Holy Father pointed to their activity as an example of the way in which the Church can flourish where Catholics are in a minority. "It may be interesting and surprising," he said, "for the historian to encounter in the United States of America one example, among others, of the way in which the Church succeeds in flourishing in the most disparate situations."

We should be grateful to God that He has caused His Church to prosper and to flourish in this country as it has done in few places else in the course of history. It has done this without any complete unanimity of action between itself and the state. Yet, when we look at this matter in the light of the Catholic truth, presented in this section of the papal discourse *Vous avez voulu,* it is easy to see that the close and cordial co-operation with the Church

that is normal for the state is not designated as good and as normal precisely because such collaboration is necessary for the Church, but basically because it is morally right. It is definitely right that states, as well as individual human beings, should recognize the unique responsibility and authority God has granted to His Church. It is always regrettable that such recognition is not accorded.

The Church can and does endure and prosper even when such recognition is not given by the state. Sometimes it may flourish even more vigorously in a country where this recognition is not granted than it does in a state that actually collaborates with it. When the Holy Father, expounding the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church, asserts that the collaboration of the state with the Church is an ideal, he is speaking as the authoritative teacher of faith and morals, and not simply as one who is trying to point out conditions under which the Church can most effectively operate in a given country at a given time.

Ultimately, we must not forget, the one reason why there should be full and cordial collaboration between the state and the Catholic Church is the fact that Our Lord Himself has entrusted the field of religion to the Catholic Church alone. It is impossible for a person who fails to realize that the visible Catholic Church is actually the kingdom of God on earth, the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, to be properly aware of the unique competence of the Church in the sphere of religion. The visible Catholic Church, established by Our Lord during the course of His public life on this earth, was constituted by Him as God's *ecclesia,* as His kingdom of the New Testament.

It is a visible and organized society. But, at the same time, it is the one social unit within which men are to achieve the eternal and supernatural end for which God has put them on earth. It is only right and proper that all men and all groups of men should acknowledge it for what it really is, and that they should seek, in every way, to work with it and in it for the achievement of its purpose.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Answers to Questions

ATTENDANCE AT CCD CLASSES

Question: Is it a mortal sin for a Catholic pupil in a public high school to miss habitually the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine classes, adducing as his reason the desire to take part in social or athletic events which are held the same evenings as the classes?

Answer: It is vitally important that the younger generation of Catholics possess a thorough knowledge of their faith, in order to be protected against the false and immoral ideas that are so common today. Hence, it can be unhesitatingly asserted that a Catholic student in a public high school is bound under pain of mortal sin to keep up the regular study of Catholic doctrine. Strictly speaking, this would not necessarily entail attendance at the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine classes. If his parents were able and willing to give him the necessary instruction, they could fulfill this duty themselves, for they are the first educators of their sons and daughters (Can. 1113). Or, they could depute some competent person to perform this task. But, as is very evident, such instances are so rare as to be well-nigh merely theoretical. For practical purposes it can be safely stated that all Catholic boys and girls attending public schools will obtain the necessary knowledge of their faith only by regularly attending the classes conducted under parish auspices. Hence, they are guilty of mortal sin if they habitually neglect these classes, apart from some very serious reason. The desire to take part in social or athletic events is not such a reason.

DISTANCE TO A CATHOLIC SCHOOL

Question: A Catholic boy lives twenty-five miles distant from a Catholic high school. However, the pastor provides bus transportation, and will also pay the tuition if necessary. There is a public high school near the boy's home. Is the inconvenience of travelling two hours a day a sufficient reason to justify the boy in attending the public school in preference to the Catholic school?

Answer: Since it is so important that Catholic children, especially those of high school age, attend a Catholic school in preference to

a public school, Catholic boys and girls should be willing to put up with a considerable amount of inconvenience in order to enjoy the privilege of a Catholic education. Parents, too, should be aware of their obligation to provide a Catholic education for their children, and should require them to attend a Catholic school, instead of a public school, even when sacrifice and effort are demanded. Now, it does not seem that a one-hour bus trip in the morning and the same in the afternoon involve too great inconvenience to a boy or a girl, when a Catholic education is at stake. In former days many Catholic children spent a much longer time every day in walking to a Catholic school and back, and neither they nor their parents regarded it as an extraordinary hardship. Since, therefore, the inconvenience of the bus-trip is the only excuse that the boy in question can allege to exempt him from getting a Catholic education in preference to the secular education he will receive in the public school, I would answer that he is bound to go to the Catholic high school.

QUANTITY OF OIL TO BE BLESSED ON HOLY THURSDAY

Question: In there a strict obligation to have enough oil blessed by the Bishop on Holy Thursday to supply the diocese, by a reasonable presumption, for the entire year, or may a smaller quantity be blessed with the definite intention of adding some unblessed oil, as necessity demands?

Answer: The Code allows the addition of unblessed oil, even on repeated occasions, to that which was blessed on Holy Thursday, provided the amount added is less than the amount remaining (Can. 734, §2). However, it is certainly the mind of the Church that this process be employed only when the need of more blessed oil arises from circumstances that were not foreseen on Holy Thursday. Abbo-Hannan say: "The addition of unblessed oil is justified only by necessity" (*The Sacred Canons* [St. Louis, 1952], I, 742). Fr. Adrian Kilker asserts: "As a rule the bishops should consecrate a sufficient amount at the ceremony on Holy Thursday to supply the diocese for the entire year. It is not allowable to bless a small quantity on that day and immediately afterwards increase the amount by successive additions of unblessed

oil" (*Extreme Unction* [St. Louis, 1927], p. 330). The Congregation of Sacred Rites, on Jan. 28, 1910, reprobated the custom of blessing a small quantity of oil on Holy Thursday and immediately increasing it by addition (*AAS*, II, 118), renewing a decree of Dec. 7, 1844 (*Decreta authentica S. Cong. Rit.*, n. 2883). It is true, these decisions of the Holy See speak of an addition *immediately* after the blessing; but a like incongruity would be present, it seems, if the addition were done later, provided it was intended from the beginning. Hence, it is the duty of those in charge of the blessing of the holy oils on Holy Thursday to prepare a sufficient quantity of the different oils to supply the entire diocese for the coming year, as far as can be reasonably anticipated.

DRUNKENNESS INDUCED FOR EXPERIMENTAL PURPOSES

Question: In some experiments recently employed to determine the effects of alcoholism, and particularly the effects of the withdrawal of liquor from an habitual drunkard, men were kept in a state of intoxication for a lengthy period—in some instances for almost three months uninterruptedly. Are such experiments morally justifiable, supposing that doctors can derive from them information that may be very helpful toward curing alcoholics of their unfortunate tendencies?

Answer: To reply adequately to this very practical question, we must first discuss some more general topics—in the first place, the reason for the sinfulness of voluntary intoxication. Sometimes it is stated that the moral deordination found in drunkenness consists in the fact that a person who deliberately gets drunk thereby voluntarily deprives himself of the use of reason. But this statement is not adequate. A person may voluntarily deprive himself of the use of reason by the use of anaesthetics when there is sufficient reason for doing so—for example, in order to avoid the pain of a surgical operation—without committing any sin. The sinfulness of drunkenness, therefore, is to be found in the manner and the motive of the deprivation of reason induced by deliberate excess in the use of alcoholic beverages. In the words of Father Merkelbach, the deprivation of the use of reason through intoxication is evil "because it is done without a just cause, merely for the sake of

pleasure and gluttony, and not through the quiet and natural mode instituted by God, namely, sleep, but violently and in an unnatural manner, by the disturbance of the organs." This author then goes on to explain that voluntarily induced intoxication can be good, if it is necessary for the health of the body—for example, to ward off disease, to help in a surgical operation, etc. (Merkelbach, *Summa theologiae moralis* [Paris, 1938], I, n. 985).

Another topic pertinent to this question is the morality of experimentation on living human beings in order to obtain medical knowledge that will benefit many persons in need of medical treatment. It seems very probable that a certain measure of experimentation involving some (though not serious) physical or psychic injury to the subject may be morally permissible, if great good may result from the knowledge thus acquired. Some statements of Pope Pius XII can be justly regarded as implying the lawfulness of this procedure. Thus, in 1952 the Sovereign Pontiff declared to a group of histopathologists: "The patient has no right to involve his physical or psychic integrity in medical experiments or research when they entail, either immediately or subsequently, serious destructions, mutilations, wounds or dangers" (*AAS,* XLIV, 782). Two years later he said to the delegates to the Eighth Congress of the World Medical Association: "[The doctor] cannot submit himself to scientific experiments or practices that entail serious harm or threaten his life. Still less is he authorized to attempt an experiment which, according to authoritative information, may involve mutilation or suicide" (*AAS,* XLVI, 593). In emphasizing the unlawfulness of operations that may involve *serious* harm or danger of death, the Pope seems to have indicated that a limited amount of experimentation with human beings, involving some injury, is permissible. This conclusion has been drawn by several reliable theologians, particularly Fr. Gerald Kelly, S.J., and Fr. John Ford, S.J. In an excellent treatment of this subject appearing in *Theological Studies* for September, 1955, Father Kelly upholds the opinion that experiments for the good of others may be permitted, provided: (a) the subject freely consents, (b) that no experiment which directly inflicts grave injury or death is used, and (c) that all reasonable precautions are taken to avoid even the indirect causing of grave injury or death (p. 389). I believe that this view is sufficiently probable to be followed safely in practice.

This brings us to the question at hand. Is it morally lawful, in the interests of medical research, for a person voluntarily to drink excessively so that the reactions may be observed? Of course, the phrase "to drink excessively" is somewhat ambiguous, since it can be applied both to a slight degree of intoxication and to complete drunkenness. But, even accepting the term in the latter sense, I believe that it can be permitted if the conditions laid down by Father Kelly are observed. For, induced drunkenness, with certain qualifications, will not usually cause great harm, either psychic or physical; and it would seem that competent medical men can, from such an experiment, derive considerable knowledge toward the cure of alcoholics. If deliberate drunkenness in the interests of one's own bodily welfare is sometimes allowed, why may it not be permitted (the proper conditions being observed) for the welfare of others?

Great care, however, must be observed in proposing this conclusion. It must be emphasized that the experimentation may not be brought to a state that would involve grave danger of serious harm to the subject, either psychic, moral or physical. The degree of intoxication must not be greater than is necessary for obtaining the required information. There must be proper supervision of the subject during the experiment. The period of time over which the condition of inebriety is maintained must not be so great as to endanger seriously the subject's health or subsequent tendencies. I believe that induced intoxication over a period of two or three months (at least if it is complete intoxication) could not be justified, because it would very likely cause grave danger to the subject's health, and moreover induce a strong proclivity toward excessive drinking. But it might be allowed to keep a volunteer intoxicated for several days, if reliable doctors were of the opinion that no serious harm would result and that the resulting information would greatly benefit alcoholics and drunkards.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

RINGING OF BELLS

Question: In training altar boys I am confused what to tell them about ringing the bell at the time of the consecration. In some places the altar boy rings the bell more than once. Which is correct?

Answer: Dom Britt directs that the altar boy rings the bell a total of six times at the Consecration of the Mass. These six times are for each of the four genuflections and when the priest elevates both the Sacred Host and the Chalice. A single ring is given at each genuflection and at the elevation proper. The author does state that "the rubric here permits that the bell be rung but twice, and that continuously from the time the priest begins to elevate the Host or Chalice till he again replaces it on the altar. The former is the better method and the one in general use." Father O'Connell (*Celebration of Mass*) directs that the altar boy "may ring three separate times or continuously until the priest has placed the Host on the corporal." He bases this statement on the *Ritus servandus in celebratione missae,* VIII, 6.

TONE OF VOICE TO BE USED AT MASS

Question: Are there any definite rules about the loudness of voice to be used by one offering Mass at a side altar while a High Mass or the principal parish Mass is being offered at the main altar?

Answer: The loud or clear voice used by a priest at Mass will vary in intensity according to circumstances. If he is in a very large church, quite naturally he will recite the Mass prayers with a clearer and stronger voice than in a small church. His voice will be lower and less loud if another priest be saying Mass nearby, in order not to disturb him. He can do so without offending against the prescribed tones of voice for the proper offering of Holy Mass.

THE TIME FOR THE EULOGY AT A FUNERAL

Question: Precisely when should the sermon or eulogy take place at a funeral? Should the sign of the cross be made by the celebrant over the casket when he recites or sings the words, "Requiem aeternam" etc.?

Answer: The *Caeremoniale episcoporum* (Lib. II, Cap. XI, 10) directs that the eulogy or funeral sermon should be given between the Mass and the absolution. Nothing is mentioned in the Ritual about a funeral sermon or eulogy. We read in the Ritual (VI, iii, 14) that the celebrant makes the sign of the cross over the corpse at the words: "Requiem aeternam dona ei, Domine."

DIMENSIONS OF ALTAR LINENS

Question: The altar society at our parish makes our altar linens. I am at a loss what to say when they ask for the various dimensions required for these linens. Please give me such information.

Answer: The top altar cloth will vary according to the dimensions of the altar. However, it should extend the full length of the altar and fall to the floor on either side.

The following dimensions are only recommended and not prescribed by law: corporal, about twenty or twenty-two inches square; pall, large enough to cover the chalice and paten; purificator, twenty by twelve inches (some recommend that the purificator be twice the height of the chalice plus the diameter of the cup); finger towel, twenty by sixteen inches.

WEARING OF THE PALLIUM

Question: Recently I attended an ordination and saw the ordaining prelate wearing an ornament over the chasuble. This ornament was removed by the master of ceremonies after the blessing of the Mass. Please explain.

Answer: Our inquirer refers to the pallium worn by an Archbishop in his own jurisdiction. Its significance is both personal and territorial, so that an archbishop on being transferred to another residential see must ask for a new pallium; it is not conferred on non-residential titular archbishops. It is the symbol of the fulness of the episcopal power enjoyed by the Pope and shared in by archbishops. The pallium may be worn only on certain days, such occasions being laid down in the *Pontificale*. It may be worn on days when major orders are being conferred, and on the great feasts like Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, etc.

WHEN THE LAITY SHOULD STAND, SIT, OR KNEEL AT HIGH MASS

Question: I have noticed the laity, when attending High Mass either in my church or other places, are at a loss to know when to stand, sit and kneel. There seem to be great differences in this practice. Could you give some specific regulations?

Answer: The rubrics of the Missal direct the priests *in choro* when to sit, kneel and stand. However, there is nothing specifically set down for the laity. Some liturgists hold that the laity should follow those in the sanctuary and so we set down the order prescribed for those *in choro.* We have in mind the directions for the ordinary High or Solemn Mass and not the Requiem Mass.

Stand while the celebrant approaches the altar.

Kneel from the beginning of Mass until the celebrant ascends the steps of the altar.

Stand from the time the celebrant ascends the altar until he goes to the sedilia after intoning the Gloria.

Sit while the choir sings the Gloria.

Stand from the time the celebrant rises from the sedilia until he has finished the singing of the Collects.

Sit from the beginning of the Epistle until the deacon begins to sing the Gospel. (Do not stand while the celebrant reads the Gospel.)

Stand during the singing of the Gospel and while the celebrant recites the Credo.

Sit when the celebrant sits. Remain seated during the singing of the Credo, even the words: "Et incarnatus est."

Stand when the celebrant rises and returns to the altar and remain standing until he has sung the word, "Oremus."

Sit from the "Oremus" of the Offertory to the "Per omnia saecula saeculorum" of the Preface. Rise when the congregation is incensed and sit again unless the Preface has already started.

Stand from the beginning of the Preface until the celebrant has recited the Sanctus.

Kneel from the Sanctus until after the Elevation of the Chalice.

Stand from the Elevation of the Chalice until the celebrant has consumed the Precious Blood.

Sit from the Communion of the Chalice until the celebrant sings "Dominus vobiscum."

Stand from "Dominus Vobiscum" until after the "Ite Missa Est."

Kneel during the blessing.

Stand for the Last Gospel and remain standing until the celebrant has left the sanctuary.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

Analecta

THE HOLY FATHER'S ADDRESS TO THE TENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF HISTORICAL SCIENCES

Many of you, gentlemen, have wanted to come to pay Us a visit on the occasion of the tenth International Congress of Historical Sciences. We welcome you with great pleasure in the conviction that this event is of great significance. Never, perhaps, has so distinguished a group of history scholars met in Rome, the seat of the Church and the home of the Pope. We in no way feel, moreover, that We are meeting unknown persons or strangers. Some of you, in fact, are among the thousands of historians who have worked in the Vatican Library or Archives, open for exactly 75 years. Besides this, your activities as researchers and professors will have given to most of you, if not to all of you, an opportunity of entering in some way into contact with the Catholic Church and the Papacy.

Although history is an ancient science, it was necessary to wait until recent centuries and the development of historical criticism before it attained its present degree of perfection. Thanks to the rigorous demands of its methods and the untiring zeal of its specialists, you can rejoice at knowing the past in greater detail and at judging it with greater accuracy than any of your predecessors. This fact still further emphasizes the importance We attach to your presence here. History is one of the sciences which have a close relationship with the Catholic Church. This is true to such a degree that We were unable to welcome you just now without mentioning the fact almost involuntarily. The Catholic Church is herself an historical fact. Like a mighty mountain range she traverses the history of the past 2,000 years. Whatever attitude a person may adopt towards her, therefore, it is impossible to avoid her. The judgments people have made concerning her are quite varied; they range from complete acceptance to the most decisive rejection. But whatever the final verdict of the historian, whose task is to observe and explain facts, events and circumstances—insofar as possible as they actually happened—the Church believes that she can in any case expect him to inform himself of the historical con-

sciousness the Church has of herself. That is to say, she expects him to inform himself on the way she considers herself as an historical fact and on the way she regards her relationship to the history of mankind.

We should like to say a word about this consciousness the Church has of herself by citing facts, circumstances and concepts that seem to Us to have the most basic significance.

To begin with We should like to answer an objection that presents itself, so to speak, at the very outset. Christianity, it has been said and is still being said, necessarily takes a hostile position in regard to history because it sees in it a manifestation of evil and sin. Catholicism and historicism, therefore, are antithetical concepts. Let Us first remark that an objection expressed in this way considers history and historicism as equivalent conceptions. In this it is wrong. The term "historicism" denotes a philosophic system which perceives in all spiritual reality, in the knowledge of truth, in religion, morality and law only change and evolution. Consequently it rejects all that is permanent, eternally valid and absolute. Such a system is assuredly incompatible with the Catholic conception of the world and, in general, with any religion which recognizes a personal God.

The Catholic Church knows that all events take place according to the will or permission of Divine Providence and that God attains His objectives in history. As the great St. Augustine said with classic brevity, what God proposes "is done, is brought about and, even though it be done gradually, it is done inevitably."[1] God is truly the Lord of history.

This statement in itself has already answered the above-mentioned objection. No opposition can be discovered between Christianity and history in the sense that history is only an emanation or manifestation of evil. The Church has never taught such a doctrine. Since Christian antiquity and the patristic age, and most especially at the time of the spiritual struggle with Protestantism and Jansenism, she has taken a clear position on the side of nature. She says regarding nature that it has not been corrupted by sin, that it has remained inwardly intact even in fallen man. She says that men before Christianity and men who are not Christians could and can perform good and honest acts, even excluding the

[1] *Ennarratio in Psalm. 109*, n. 9. *MPL*, XXXVII, 1452.

fact that all men—even those who lived before the Christian era—are under the influence of Christ's grace.

The Church willingly recognizes great and good realities even if they existed before herself and outside of her domain. St. Augustine, upon whom her opponents often rely by falsely interpreting his *De Civitate Dei,* who did not himself hide his pessimism, is also absolutely clear. To the tribune and imperial notary Flavius Marcellinus, to whom he dedicated that great work, he wrote: "For God, in the wealthy and glorious empire of the Romans, has shown how much civic virtues are worth even without the true religion. He has shown this in such a way that it might be understood that with this [true religion] added, men become citizens of another city, whose king is truth, whose law is charity and whose mode is eternity."[2] St. Augustine expressed in these words the constant opinion of the Church.

Let Us now speak of the Church herself as an historical fact. At the same time that she fully asserts her divine origin and supernatural character, the Church is aware that she entered into human history as an historical fact. Her Divine Founder, Jesus Christ, is an historical person. His life, death and resurrection are historical facts. It sometimes happens that even those who deny the divinity of Christ admit His resurrection because it is, in their understanding of the word, too well attested historically. Whoever would like to deny it would have to wipe out all of ancient history, for none of its facts is better proven than the resurrection of Christ.

The mission and development of the Church are historical facts. Here in Rome it is fitting to cite SS. Peter and Paul. Paul, even from a purely historical point of view, belongs among humanity's most remarkable figures. As for the Apostle Peter and his position in the Church of Christ, although the monumental proof of Peter's residence and death in Rome has no essential importance for the Catholic faith, We nevertheless have had widely known excavations carried out under the Basilica. Their method is approved by (historical) criticism. Their result—the discovery of Peter's tomb under the cupola, just beneath the present Papal altar—was admitted by the great majority of critics. Even the most severe skeptics were impressed by what the excavations brought to light. We have reason to believe, moreover, that further research and

[2] *Epist. 130,* n. 17. *MPL,* XXXIII, 533.

study will again lead to the acquisition of new and valuable knowledge.

The origins of Christianity and the Catholic Church are historical facts, ascertained and proven in time and in space. Of that the Church is quite aware.

She also knows that her mission, although by its nature and its goals it belongs to the religious and moral domain, situated in the beyond and eternity, nevertheless penetrates to the very heart of human history. Always and everywhere, by unceasingly adapting herself to the circumstances of time and place, she seeks to model persons, individuals and, as far as possible, all individuals according to the laws of Christ, thus attaining the moral basis for social life. The object of the Church is man, naturally good, imbued, ennobled and strengthened by the truth and grace of Christ.

The Church wants to make men "established in their inviolable integrity as images of God; men proud of their personal dignity and of their wholesome freedom; men justly jealous of their equality with their fellow creatures in all that concerns the most intimate depths of human dignity; men solidly attached to their land and their tradition." That is the intention of the Church as We expressed it in Our address of February 20, 1946, when We conferred birettas on the new Cardinals.[3]

We might add that in the present century as in the past century, when the problems of the family, society, the state and the social order have assumed an ever growing and even primary importance, the Church has done everything in her power to contribute to the solution of such problems and has had, We believe, some success. The Church is persuaded, however, that she can do no more effective work in this sphere than to continue to form men in the fashion We have described.

To attain its goals the Church functions not only as an ideological system. Without doubt she is described as such when people use the expression "Catholicism," which is neither her own customary usage nor a fully adequate term. She is far more than a simple ideological system. She is a reality, like visible nature, the people, or the state. She is a living organism with her own ends and her own principle of life. Unchangeable in the constitution and structure her Divine Founder Himself gave to her, she has

[3] *AAS*, XXXVIII (1946), 147.

accepted and still accepts those elements she needs or deems useful for her development and activity: men, and human institutions, philosophical and cultural inspirations, political forces and social institutions, ideas, principles and activities.

The Church, in extending herself throughout the world, has also undergone various changes in the course of the centuries. But in her essence she has always remained the same because the many elements she received were from the beginning made subject to the same basic faith. The Church may be incredibly broad. She may show herself as inflexibly strict. If one considers the whole of her history he will see that she has been both one and the other with a sure instinct for what was fitting for various peoples and the whole of mankind. She has rejected all overly naturalistic movements, which have in some way been contaminated by a spirit of moral license, as well as gnostic tendencies, falsely spiritual and puritanical.

The history of canon law up to the code currently in force furnishes a good number of significant proofs of this. Take, for example, the ecclesiastical legislation on marriage and the recent Papal statements on all aspects of the questions of the married state and the family. You will find there one example, among many others, of the way in which the Church thinks and works.

By virtue of an analogous principle she has regularly intervened in the domain of public life in order to guarantee a just balance between right and duty on the one hand, and law and freedom on the other. Political authority has never had an advocate more worthy of trust than the Catholic Church, for the Church bases the authority of the state on the will of the Creator and on the commandment of God. Because she attributes a religious value to public authority, the Church is assuredly opposed to arbitrariness on the part of the state and to all forms of tyranny. Our predecessor, Leo XIII, in his encyclical *Immortale Dei* of November 1, 1885, wrote: "And in truth whatever in the state is of chief avail for the common welfare; whatever has been usefully established to curb the license of rulers who are opposed to the true interests of the people, or to keep in check the leading authorities from unwarrantably interfering in municipal or family affairs; whatever tends to uphold the honor, manhood and equal rights of individual citizens; of all these things, as the monuments of past ages bear witness, the Catholic Church has always been the origi-

nator, the promoter or guardian."[4] When Leo XIII wrote these words seventy years ago, his eyes turned towards the past, he was not able to see to what tests the immediate future was to put them. Today We believe we can say that during these seventy years the Church has shown herself faithful to her past and even that she has gone far beyond the statements of Leo XIII.

* * * * *

We have now arrived at a point where We should like to deal with two problems which merit very special attention: the relations between the Church and the State and between the Church and culture.

In the pre-Christian era public authority, the state, was as competent in the religious domain as in profane matters. The Catholic Church is aware that her Divine Founder has transferred to her the sphere of religion, the religious and moral direction of men, to the fullest extent, and independently of the power of the state. Since that time there has existed a history of relations between the Church and the State and this history has strongly attracted the attention of scholars.

Leo XIII, so to speak, expressed in a formula the proper nature of these relations, of which he gives an enlightening explanation in his encyclicals *Diuturnum Illud* (1881), *Immortale Dei* (1885) and *Sapientiae Christianae* (1890). The two powers, the Church and the State, are sovereign. Their nature, as the ends they pursue, fix the limits within which they govern "by their own right." As the state, the Church also possesses a sovereign right to all she needs, even the material means, to reach her goal. "Whatever, therefore, in things human is of a sacred character, whatever belongs, either of its own nature or by reason of the end to which it is referred, to the salvation of souls or to the worship of God, is subject to the power and the judgment of the Church."[5] While Church and State are independent powers, they should not because of this ignore one another and still less fight one another. It is far more in conformity to nature and the Divine Will if they co-operate in mutual understanding, since their activities apply to the same subject, namely to the Catholic citizen. Certainly cases

[4] *Leonis XIII P. M. Acta*, V, 142.

[5] *Ibid.*, V, 127 f. The quotation is from the *Immortale Dei*.

of conflict remain possible and, when the laws of the state do harm to divine law, the Church has a moral duty to oppose them.

It can be said that with the exception of a few centuries—for all the first 1,000 years as for the last 400—the formula of Leo XIII reflects more or less clearly the mind of the Church. Even during the intervening period, moreover, there were representatives of the doctrine of the Church—perhaps even a majority—who shared the same opinion.

When our predecessor Boniface VIII on April 30, 1303, told the envoys of the German King Albert of Hapsburg ". . . as the moon has no light apart from that which it receives from the sun, so no earthly power has anything except what it receives from the ecclesiastical power. . . . All powers . . . are from Christ and from Us, as the Vicar of Jesus Christ . . ."[6]—it was a case of perhaps the most emphatic statement of the so-called medieval idea of the relations between the spiritual and temporal powers. From this idea men like Boniface drew logical conclusions. But even for them there was here normally only the question of the transmission of authority as such, not of the designation of its holder, as Boniface himself stated at the Consistory of June 24, 1302.[7] This medieval conception was conditioned by the times. Those who know its sources will probably admit that it would undoubtedly have been even more astonishing had it not appeared.

They will also concede, perhaps, that in accepting battles such as that concerning investiture, the Church defended highly spiritual and moral ideals and that, from the time of the Apostles to our own day, her efforts to remain independent of the civil power have always looked to safeguarding the freedom of religious convictions. Let no one object that the Church herself scorns the personal convictions of those who do not think as she does. The Church has considered and still considers that the willing abandonment of the true faith is a sin. When, beginning about 1200, such a defection entailed penal proceedings on the part of the spiritual as well as the temporal power, it was only to avoid the destruction of the religious and ecclesiastical unity of the West. To non-Catholics the Church applies the principle contained in the Code of Canon Law, "Let no one be forced against his will to embrace

[6] *Monumenta Germaniae hist.*, LL., sect. IV, tom. IV, part. 1, p. 139.

[7] Cf. Bulaeus, *Historia Universitatis Parisiensis* (Paris, 1688), IV, 31 ff.

the Catholic faith."[8] She believes that their convictions constitute a reason, although not always the principal one, for tolerance. We have already dealt with the subject in Our address of December 6, 1593, to the Catholic lawyers of Italy.

The historian should not forget that, while the Church and State have known hours and years of conflict, there were also from the time of Constantine the Great until the contemporary era and even recently, tranquil periods, often quite long ones, during which they collaborated with full understanding in the education of the same people. The Church does not hide the fact that in principle she considers such collaboration normal and that she regards the unity of the people in the true religion and the unanimity of action between herself and the state as an ideal. But she also knows that for some time events have been evolving rather in a different direction, that is to say towards the multiplicity of religious beliefs and conceptions of life within the same national community, where Catholics are a more or less strong minority. It may be interesting and surprising for the historian to encounter in the United States of America one example, among others, of the way in which the Church succeeds in flourishing in the most disparate situations.

In the history of relations between the Church and State, the Concordats, as you know, play an important part. What We have set forth on this subject in the address of December 6, 1953, which We cited earlier, is also valuable for the historical appreciation that one has of Concordats. In Concordats, let Us say, the Church seeks the juridical security and independence necessary to her mission. "It is possible, let Us add, for the Church and State to proclaim in a Concordat their common religious conviction. But it may also happen that the Concordat has for its goal, among others, the prevention of conflicts about questions of principle and avoidance from the beginning of possible occasions for conflict. When the Church puts her signature to a Concordat, the approval applies to all of its contents. But the deeper meaning may include shades of meaning about which the contracting parties both know. It may signify an expressed approval, but it may also provide for simple tolerance . . . according to the principles which

[8] *Can.* 1351.

serve as a norm for the coexistence of the Church and her faithful with the powers and men of different belief."[9]

* * * * *

The Church and culture: The Catholic Church has exercised a powerful and even decisive influence over the cultural development of the past 2,000 years. But she is quite convinced that the source of this influence lies in the spiritual element which characterizes her—her religious and moral life. This is true to such a degree that if this spiritual element were to be weakened, her cultural influence—for example, what she radiates for the benefit of the social order and peace—would also suffer.

Some historians, or more exactly, perhaps, philosophers of history think that the place of Christianity and therefore of the Catholic Church is as Karl Jaspers thought "a late development" in the Western world.[10] That the work of Christ is "a late development" is a question We do not have any intention of discussing here. Essentially, in fact, it is devoid of interest, and, moreover, one cannot make conjectures as to the future of mankind. What is important to Us is that the Church is aware of having received her mission and her task for all time to come and for all men. She is consequently not tied to any specific culture. St. Augustine was profoundly affected when the conquest of Rome by Alaric brought upon the Roman empire the first convulsions which presaged its ruins. But he did not think that it would last forever. "The things that God Himself has made will pass away; how much more quickly what Romulus has established," he said.[11] In the *De civitate Dei* he clearly distinguished between the existence of the Church and the destiny of the empire. This was to think as a Catholic.

What people call the West or the Western world has undergone profound changes since the Middle Ages: the religious split of the 16th century, rationalism and liberalism leading to the state of the 19th century, to its power politics, and to its secularized civilization. It therefore became inevitable that relations between the Catholic Church and the West underwent a change. But one

[9] *AAS,* XLV (1953), 802.
[10] *Vom Ursprung und Ziel der Geschichte,* 1955, p. 65.
[11] *Sermo* 105, c. 7, n. 10, *MPL,* XXXVIII, 623.

cannot characterize even the culture of the Middle Ages themselves as *the* Catholic culture. It, too, although closely tied to the Church, drew its elements from different sources. Even the religious unity of the Middle Ages was not peculiar to them. It was also a typical mark of Christian antiquity in the Roman empire in both the East and the West from Constantine the Great to Charlemagne.

The Catholic Church does not identify itself with any culture. Her very nature forbids her to do so. She is, however, ready to enter into relations with all cultures. The Church recognizes and allows to continue in existence those things which are not opposed to nature. But in each of them she introduces, in addition, the truth and grace of Jesus Christ. And thus she confers upon them a profound resemblance. It is in this way that the Church contributes most effectively to obtaining world peace.

The whole world still submits today to the action of another element which, it is predicted, will provoke in the history of mankind (in its temporal aspects) great upheavals. This element is science and modern technology which Europe, or more accurately the Western nations, have created during recent centuries. Those who have not assimilated them are called backward and will be eliminated. Those which do assimilate them, on the contrary, must also consent to face the dangers which they have for "the human being."[12] In fact, science and technology are in the process of becoming the common property of mankind. What concerns us is not only the dangers which threaten the human being, but the statement that science and technology show themselves incapable of preventing the spiritual alienation which separates races and continents; this last seems, on the contrary, to be growing. If people want to avoid catastrophe, it will therefore be necessary to put into operation at the same time, and on a high level, powerful religious and moral forces of unification and to make them also the common property of mankind. The Catholic Church is aware of possessing such forces, and she believes that she is not obliged to furnish historical proof of these forces. For the rest, in the face of modern science and technology, she does not isolate herself in opposition, but she behaves rather as a counterweight and a bal-

[12] Cf. Jaspers, *op. cit.*, pp. 67, 81.

ancing factor. Thus she will be able in an era in which science and technology are triumphant to fulfill her task as well as she fulfilled it in past centuries.

We should like to explain to you how the Church regards herself as an historical phenomenon and how she sees her task and its relations to certain other historical data. With magnanimity, Our predecessor Leo XIII opened the Vatican archives to researchers. There historians may contemplate as in a mirror the consciousness which the Church has of herself. You know that a single document can lead a person to error; but not a whole collection of archives. So, with the Vatican archives with their considerable material which covers whole pontificates and dozens of years and centuries, the Church displays throughout innumerable changes of events, men and situations, a manner of thinking and acting, characterized by convictions and determined principles. Thus the Vatican archives are a witness worthy of confidence in regard to the mind of the Catholic Church.

Wishing moreover to fulfill the desires of researchers, We are at present studying the most opportune ways of enlarging still more the gesture of Our predecessor, by making accessible to them the documents of a later period.

When he opened the Vatican archives to the public, Leo XIII recalled the classical rule which the historians must observe, according to Cicero: "The first law of history is not to dare to say anything false; and finally not to dare to leave out anything of the truth; that there be no suspicion of favor in writing and no simulation."[13] You know how many discussions there have been on the theme "science ought to be free of presuppositions." This theme was like a slogan; like all slogans it did not lack ambiguity and thus led to confusion. There is no science, at least no positive science, which can do without presuppositions. Each one postulates at least certain laws of being and thought which the science uses to develop itself. If instead of saying "free from presuppositions" it had only said "impartial!" Let science in its pursuit of truth not let itself be influenced by subjective considerations—this is a proposal with which everyone would have been able to agree.

[13] Cicero, *De oratore*, lib. 2, c. 15. Leo XIII, *Saepenumero considerantes*, Aug. 18, 1883. *Acta*, III, 268.

That each of you and the science you practice may contribute to making the historical past a lesson for the present and the future We ask for you with all our heart the most abundant divine blessings.

A Pronouncement by the Holy Office on MRA

The following is a translation of a statement by the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, published in the Semaine religieuse *of Quebec, in the issue of July 14, 1955. The statement itself was issued August 8, 1951.*

1. It is not fitting for either diocesan or religious priests, and much less for nuns, to participate in meetings of Moral Rearmament.

2. If exceptional circumstances should make such participation opportune, the permission of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office must be requested beforehand. This permission will be granted only to learned and experienced priests.

3. Finally it is not fitting that the faithful should accept posts of responsibility in Moral Rearmament, and especially not fitting that they join the so-called "policy team."

Book Reviews

THE CATHOLIC APPROACH TO PROTESTANTISM. By George H. Tavard, A.A. Foreword by George N. Shuster. Translated from the French by the author. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955. Pp. 160. $2.50.

"Like all American groups," writes Father Tavard, "they [American Catholics] also suffer from a certain dearth of historical and theological culture" (p. 61).

The Catholic Approach to Protestantism is Father Tavard's translation of his own French work, a brochure published last year in Paris and entitled *A la rencontre du protestantisme*. In the original French text, the sentence "translated" in the above citation represents Catholicism in this country as characterized by, among other things, "un infantilisme spirituel et intellectuel" (p. 51).

What Father Tavard has to say in his English translation about "all American groups" and about "American Catholics" cannot be considered as other than studiously offensive and insulting. Still, even this version, prepared as it is for the American market, is considerably less obnoxious than the French original. "Infantilisme" is an unpleasant word. It carries highly disagreeable and sordid connotations. The use of such a word with reference to Catholicism in the United States of America is utterly inexcusable.

Unfortunately, we occasionally find sweeping, uncharitable, and thoroughly erroneous judgments against Americans and against the Catholic Church in the United States in certain European publications, particularly in those of a "liberal" tendency. They occur from time to time in unscholarly brochures and even in periodicals of little repute, although even here it is rare to find anything in such shockingly bad taste as a charge of "infantilisme" levelled against Catholicism in our country.

We need not be astonished to find some evidences of anti-American bias in certain European publications of a "liberal" bent. It is surprising, however, to encounter in a book published in this country and evidently intended for American readers the bland assertion that American Catholics, and indeed all American groups, "suffer from a certain dearth of historical and theological culture." One is tempted to wonder what the reaction would be if an American priest were to attempt to publish in Paris a tract thus depreciative of and offensive to the French people and Catholicism in France.

The Catholic Approach to Protestantism is not in any sense an important, or even a serious, scholarly work. It does not tell much about ecumenicism and its problems, but it contains a great deal of information about Father Tavard's likes and dislikes. The author has made himself the advocate of the kind or kinds of ecumenicism favored by Fathers Portal, Congar, and Journet. He vehemently opposes the teaching of Father Hanahoe, and has harsh words to say about Monsignor Glenn's "attitude." He does not deign to offer any scientifically acceptable evidence in favor of his heroes or against the men he has selected as his opponents.

The type of Catholic polemicist who is prone to charge his adversaries with too great a regard for theological orthodoxy tends very frequently to substitute personal abuse for logical demonstration. Father Tavard has followed this pattern consistently. Thus, in discussing "integralism" (all of his foes seem to be "integralists"), he designates it as "a question of nervousness and unsettled temper perhaps as much as of bad theology" (p. 94). Of Monsignor Glenn's "attitude," he says that "It throws contempt on its author rather than on what it slings mud at" (p. 90). Father Hanahoe is accused, among other things, of "intellectual pettiness" (p. 97). Father Tavard asserts that people who are guilty of the charges he has just made against Fathers Hanahoe and Gannon "stand outside intellectual honesty" (p. 96).

Incidentally, the author sets forth his teaching on the most fundamental point in Catholic ecclesiology with blithe disregard for the doctrine of the encyclical *Humani generis*. Father Tavard holds that it is Catholic doctrine that "there is an *analogy* between the mystical Body of Christ . . . and the Catholic Church" (p. 78). According to the *Humani generis,* however, "the Mystical Body of Christ and the Catholic Church are one and the same thing."

Father Tavard's work can serve as a valuable object lesson to our own Catholic writers. It serves to show us that a rude and emotional attitude toward men whose views do not coincide with our own can only spoil any literary effort. In the somewhat exotic English of *The Catholic Approach to Protestantism,* "It throws contempt on its author rather than on what it slings mud at."

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

JESUS AND HIS TIMES. By Daniel-Rops. Translated from the French by Ruby Millar. New York: Dutton and Co., 1954. Pp. 615, $5.00.

Fifty years ago, so William Allen White tells us in his autobiography, he "saw Jesus, not as a figure of theology—the only begotten son who saved by his blood a sinful world—but as a statesman and phi-

losopher who dramatized his creed by giving his life for it." The great journalist was reporting what happened not only to him but to many Americans of his time, the loss of Jesus as the Son of God and the Saviour of men, the One of whom both Isaias and Matthew wrote, "In his name the nations shall hope." For that reason any good life of our Lord is welcome that will instruct this bemused age; and *Jesus and His Times* by Daniel-Rops (the pen-name of a French journalist, Henry Petiot) is most welcome. For it will be relished by reluctant Christians and unbelievers of every color who pass by abler lives of Christ. As a pledge of such an audience, the French original has gone through 400 printings and has been translated into 15 languages. Though no more capable a biography of Jesus than the many lives that have preceded it, from Fouard to Prat (as a work of scholarship Prat is much superior), it has an advantage over all of them that its author is a trained journalist, essayist, enthusiastic amateur historian and geographer, who brings to his work the power of sprightly narrative and incisive comment.

Setting aside a strictly chronological account, Daniel-Rops prefers to center upon our Lord's public years in a series of essays: the beginnings in Galilee, the training of the twelve apostles, the personality of Christ, the opposition in Judea, the passion and death, the "second life" after the Resurrection. There are preliminary chapters on the genuineness of the records about our Lord, the religious and political state of Palestine (this has a warm tribute to Jewish faith and fervor in the time of Christ as well as the two centuries before), the impact of John the Baptist, and our Lord's early years; a chapter is added which defends Jesus from the tendentious judgments of Higher Criticism. Throughout his work, Daniel-Rops succeeds in avoiding the pitfall of so many Catholic writers who turn their books into prolonged meditations, ranging far with their own speculations on our Lord's thinking and motivation. That he keeps to a minimum. His reflections on the characters of the various apostles and on the fall of Judas likewise stay short of weak sentimentality.

His two strong points are history and geography. As his title promises, he has gone to great pains to understand our Lord against the background of first-century Palestine. He examines, for example, the known history of spikenard and the alabaster vase. He calls the then shoreline of Lake Galilee "The Palestinian Riviera." He catches the odors of an Oriental city. He conjectures that Jesus visited His Bethany friends in the season of hard rainstorm. As Jesus looked at Herod's massive wall upholding the temple, Daniel-Rops sees nesting doves soar from the matted crevices white-winged into a harsh blue sky. He describes Jesus asleep outdoors of a cool, starlit night, pillowed on

a fold of His cloak, "until dawn breaks and peace is shattered by the cries of the herdsmen driving their beasts to feed." Only in one subject does he strain his sense of the geographic fitness of things, when he finds reasons why the gospel should be begun in the pleasant country of Galilee and why Christ should be crucified among the grim, apocalyptic mountains of Judea; however excused by literary license, that is poor divinity, for God is not bound by nature in the works of His providence.

The author's journalistic knack is at its best in forceful epigrams. "Henceforth he is the measure of everything that happens. The life of Christ is contained in history and contains it." "It is only in the hearts of those who love him that he implants his image." "Every man from that time has sought to find himself in him." Like Chesterton's famous lecture "Pagans and Puritans," he catches the essential sadness of the ancient world outside of Israel: "The characteristic mood of the pagan world is not joy, but a profound sense of the tragedy of the human condition." Of the gospels he writes, "Wherever their influence is ignored or shaken off, a moral deficiency manifests itself and the civilization of the west is betrayed." He ponders Nicodemus' night visits to our Lord: "Prudence is a virtue which the comfortably situated respect very highly."

Throughout the book Daniel-Rops shows a thorough allegiance to his Catholic faith. He goes beyond the text of the gospels, to find Christ in the living tradition of the Church; "the chain is established without a break from the hills of Palestine to the chair of Peter." When commenting on our Lord's words near Caesarea-Philippi, he writes a beautiful act of faith in the primacy granted to St. Peter and his successors. Of the divinely established episcopate he affirms, "There cannot be any question that the hierarchical principle preserved throughout the centuries by Catholicism is present historically in the gospels." He writes of the touchstone of all Christian belief, "History must either reject Christianity or accept the Resurrection." Daniel-Rops stands poles apart from those theorists who leave us a shadowy Christ or a pathetic prophetical figure alien to the religion of His followers.

A few errors mar this commendable work. Daniel-Rops says that the Jewish Passover is fixed (it is movable, like the Christian Easter). He says that St. John's gospel does not record a single parable (we think right away of the Good Shepherd, in chapter 10). And he calls the Apocalypse by a doubtful term, "This magnificent fantasy."

In great part the translator has done her work well, preserving the brilliance of the original in her own pleasant, readable English. She is at her best at rendering the author's rustic scenes. "A humbler landscape served the master who brought the good news; the tranquil bay

fringed with oleanders, the soft lapping of the waves on the shore, the gentle plateau framed by hills formed the amphitheatre which echoed his voice." Unfortunately many faults impair the worth of this translation. Some come from shortening the original (about one-fifth is left out), some from haste, and some from a lack of full familiarity with the rich Catholic background against which Daniel-Rops writes.

Some omissions are unimportant (though one misses, for example, the author's humorous asides about our Lady at Cana: "Women notice quickly and have such thoughtfulness," "She well understood her Son"). But others are serious. An entire treatment on the Holy Shroud of Turin is left out, to which the author attached importance, so is the touching passage where Daniel-Rops tells how the "Lord, I am not worthy" of the centurion put Ernest Psichari on the road to becoming a Catholic; so are several references to saints whom the author uses to throw a significant light on his discussion. Sometimes an omission or a wrong word changes the meaning; on page 474 we read, "This, however, in the realm of theology. Historically we know, etc." Daniel-Rops has no "however" in his text or meaning; the adverb changes his sense into an implied agnosticism about the gospels. An omission on page 299 has like harmful results: "The gospels were not composed as historical accounts"; the author had added, "in the technical meaning of the term." One sentence is shortened to the extent that we must go to the French for its understanding: "All the great religions have propounded a version of the universal enigma, the human spirit demands this at least of them." Daniel-Rops wrote: "Toutes les religions visent à proposer une explication du drame universal: c'est là, d'abord, ce que l'espirit humain leur demande: de quoi comprendre, ou tout au moins, de quoi admettre les énigmes de la vie."

Proper names are reported wrongly: Ireneus for Irenaeus, Cerinthius for Cerinthus, Antony (of Piacenza) for Antoninus, Dyonisius Exigus for Dionysius Exiguus, Papius for Papias, Anarodocests for Aphtarodocetae, Haran for Hannan, Apollonius (of Ravenna) for Apollinaris, Daniel for Elias (p. 405). A few words with an acknowledged English turn are left in their French form: Maria d'Agréda, diathèkè, Longin, Oxyrhynque. Words are wrongly translated: pectoral cross for pectoral (the high priest's breastplate), theologians for theorists (*théoriciens*), "obedient to the laws of his being" for "obedient to the laws of His other nature." Lourdes' great shrine was not "affirmed" with great solemnity by Pius IX. The well-known Greek word *metanoeite,* rightly brought into French as "soyez changés," does not mean "to be born again."

A very serious error is made in translating Daniel-Rops' footnote on the place of asceticism in the life of Christ and His apostles. "Most

of the great mystics have considered asceticism as an elementary practice which may be disregarded as the spirit progresses to higher things" (p. 317). The author wrote, "The great mystics, however, have always regarded asceticism as an almost elementary way which one must go beyond to achieve the higher stages (et qu'il faut dépasser pour attendre aux hauts états)." Dépasser" does not mean "disregard." The translation implicitly contradicts the Catholic doctrine of the need of an ascetical life throughout all mystical experience, a doctrine summed up in the Spiritual Directory of one religious order: "The higher the union with God, the more is required freedom from creatures."

For Biblical texts the publishers have chosen to use the Church of England's Authorized Version of 1611. They would have done better to select some reliable contemporary translation of the Holy Scriptures; Daniel-Rops himself used the fairly modern French version of Abbé Crampon (1899), and he kept an eye on the later *Synopsis Evangelica* of Father M.-J. Lagrange and the translations of M. Goguel and H. Pernot. Whatever the old influence of the "King James Bible" on English speech, much of its words are now archaic. It is incongruous to have the language of an up-to-date writer halted with such obscurities as "privily," "holpen," and "was an hungred."

JAMES MCVANN, C.S.P.

HOW TO MEDITATE. By Rev. A. Desbuquoit, Barnabite. Translated and arranged by Rev. G. Protopapas, O.M.I. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1955. Pp. 75. $1.00

If you qualify as a "dreamer," then you will welcome this simple and eminently practical treatment of mental prayer which Father Protopapas has now made available for English readers. In the words of the author, "Dreamers are not ascetics. They find it difficult to pray, and are prone to spend time which should be devoted to mental prayer in either day-dreaming or actual sleeping." This book has been written for such people. For the beginner, it forms an excellent introduction to the practice of meditation; for the experienced religious who may have grown stale, it provides a refreshing, if somewhat disturbing, review.

Father Desbuquoit treats briefly of the need for meditation and then is quite frank in ascribing extended failure in meditation to three causes: "routine and habit, unfaithfulness to grace, and lack of true meditation." His observations on these three causes should be of immense value to those who, after years of effort, still experience great

difficulty in meditating. Concerning the "lack of true meditation" he says, "To our minds, the main reason that so many religious do not profit from this holy exercise is that they are actually ignorant as to the real nature of mental prayer. During the appointed time for mental prayer, they are bodily present in the chapel, but they are not truly engaged in meditation. Outwardly it appears that they are; there is no doubt whatsoever as to their good intention, as to their willingness to meditate, as to their noble efforts; nevertheless they are not meditating . . . their reflections are too speculative and not practical enough, too general and not particular enough; the matters they consider have little bearing, if any at all, on their life, their problems, their ideals, their difficulties."

The second section of the book treats systematically the respective roles of meditation and prayer, the three stages of mental prayer, the process of preparing a topic for mental prayer, and the different parts of a good meditation. The author's observations concerning the use of a book during meditation are extremely interesting, but one may be permitted a slight regret that they were not written in the same clear style which characterizes the rest of the book.

Much time and trouble will be avoided if Father Desbuquoit's suggestions concerning the type of book to be used as a source for meditation are given serious consideration. He admits that "ultimately the only proper choice of a book for meditation must take into account the particular soul of the individual who is to use the book." Nevertheless quite properly he warns us to avoid historical narratives which whet our curiosity and destroy our prayer; and books treating of extraordinary mystical experiences which lack the approval of the Church and which may not only interfere with spiritual progress but also seriously injure or destroy our faith.

No book on mental prayer would be complete without some suggestions concerning those persistent tormentors: distractions. The author's rules for handling distractions, both voluntary and involuntary, are clearly and forcefully stated and give promise of much success. Those who must frequently wrestle with distractions will find encouragement in the remark that "he who suffers much from distractions in mental prayer, should be neither astonished nor alarmed, because this phenomenon is by no means rare . . . we believe that anyone who can spend a quarter of an hour without distractions . . . is a rare exception."

The final section of the book is given to a consideration of the aims of mental prayer. They are summarized as (1) to aid us in the battle against our faults, (2) to sustain us in our quest for spiritual perfection, and (3) to unite us with God. Each of these sections is brief, perhaps too brief; however there is much valuable information here for

the beginner and for the one seeking a short yet reasonably complete review. There is appended to this treatise the exhortation of St. Pius X to the Catholic Clergy on the importance of daily meditation.

This book should form a singularly effective introduction to meditation, especially for students in the minor seminary or the novitiate; there is also much here for the experienced religious who still finds himself, occasionally at least, a "dreamer."

JOHN J. KING, O.M.I.

THE WORD: A MEDITATION ON THE PROLOGUE TO ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL. By Adrienne von Speyr. Translated by Alexander Dru. New York: David McKay Co. Ltd., 1955. Pp. 159. $2.50.

Adrienne von Speyr's *The Word: a Meditation on the Prologue to St. John's Gospel* was presented to the English reading public within a few hours of the death of Cardinal Innitzer of Austria. The late Primate described the author and her work in the following terms: "The author is a lay theologian on whom rests the blessing of God. Anyone who reads her meditations on the New Testament will be astounded by the depth and fullness of the knowledge of the mysteries of Faith which they reveal. But all her knowledge leads up to the love and adoration of the Trinity. And the author looks upon it as her vocation to awaken and deepen this love and devotion. Take, therefore, and read."

Adrienne von Speyr is a doctor and the wife of Professor Werner Kaegi, Professor of History in Basle University. She became a convert to the Faith in 1940 after years of meditation on Holy Scripture. Her written works include meditations on St. John's Gospel, the Apocalypse, the Sermon on the Mount, the Ephesians, Philippians, a book on Prayer, and finally *The Handmaid of the Lord.*

The translation by Alexander Dru retains the spirit of the language in which it was composed without losing the very effective acuity of expression intended by the author. The work has little in the way of the ebb and flow of ideas. It reminds the reviewer of a fast stream cascading over craggy rocks. There are too many ideas in a given paragraph to allow for orderly and systematic development.

The eighteen verses of the prologue to St. John's Gospel are divided into twelve chapters. The outline of the work would indicate a development similar to that found in some scriptural commentaries. The development is definitely not scriptural, nor is it on the other hand what